Precepts and Lineage in Chan Tradition: Cross-Cultural Perspectives in Ninth Century East Asia

PEI-YING LIN

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD in Study of Religions

YEAR 2011

Department of Study of Religions

School of Oriental and African Studies

University of London

Declaration for PhD thesis

I have read and understood regulation 17.9 of the Regulations for students of the School of Oriental and African Studies concerning plagiarism. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.

Signed: ____________________________ Date: _________________

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to shed new light on the early stages of the development of Chan Buddhism in China by adducing a wider range of sources than has been usual hitherto and by seeking a better understanding of the correlations between the key elements which were eventually fused into "Chan Buddhism." This thesis points out two problems in current scholarship on early Chan Buddhism: the first is that of discussing Chan Buddhism within a framework of "the" Chan School; the second is that of analysing Chinese Buddhism without including perspectives from Japan and Korea.

In the Japanese bibliographies by Saichō (767–822), Ennin (794-864) and Enchin (814 – 891), there is a pattern of linkage between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. Three chapters are devoted to the role of these scriptures in a wider intellectual and political context. Both scriptures served functions in the acquisition of authority in a period understood as the "end of the dharma." The following two chapters probe into the theme of "Dharma flowing east," which emerged around the sixth century and then took shape in the reincarnation story concerning Shōtoku Taishi (573-621) in the eighth century and in the biographies by Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn (857-?) in the Silla Kingdom. The logic of occupying Buddhist centre position by using Chan Buddhism turned out to be a continuing process from China to Japan and Korea.

This is about the paradoxical relationship between the transmission of "enlightenment" "from mind to mind" and the persistent role of precepts, lineage lines, and various institutional perceptions, including international ones. The result is a redefinition of the implications of the figure of Bodhidharma, of the ways in which Chan Buddhism functions, and the approach of Chan to the acquisition and assertion of authority.

Table of Contents

Introduction

General Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to shed new light on the early stages of the development of Chan Buddhism in China by adducing a wider range of sources than has been usual hitherto and by seeking a better understanding of the correlations between the key elements which played a role in its formation. In spite of the excellence of much recent scholarship focusing on particular aspects of Chan during the Tang Dynasty (618-907), the overall picture is fragmentary. Even recent scholarship on important Tang monks, in particular Mazu 馬祖 (709–788) and Zongmi 宗密 (780-841), provides only a partial perspective and is problematic when it comes to representation of the whole sweep of the development of Chan before the innovations of the Five Dynasties (907-960) period. Of course, it is widely recognised that the very idea of Chan Buddhism, with a history, was constructed retrospectively during the Song Dynasty (960-1279). However in the construction of this picture, the influence of the scholar monk Zongmi was considerable, and later scholars have therefore tended to follow his picture of things. Zongmi, being himself of the Huayan (Skt. Avataṃsaka) persuasion, tended towards an integrative view. On the one hand he began to integrate the doctrines and histories of ten diverse Chan schools into one grand narrative, and on the other hand he was strongly in favour of an integration of scholasticism and meditation. However, his presentations do not correspond to earlier realities, which were more diffuse, even though there was a certain logic to the patterns of elements which retrospectively can be seen to have been relevant.

In general, modern scholarship has overlooked what Zongmi overlooked. This occurred not least because contemporary Japanese sources have not been adduced, which could have provided a corrective. We should remember that Zongmi was a contemporary of the visiting Japanese monk Saichō 最澄 (767-822) and that Saichō's memorials and bibliographies provide important evidence of the development of Buddhism in China up to his time, including "Chan" Buddhism, which for him was simply a part of the whole. Thus we are calling here for a new categorisation of the sources for early Chan Buddhism. Although the Japanese perspective presented by Saichō and his disciples is also a partial view, it has not been considered enough in current scholarship. Beyond that, the dissertation as a whole seeks to provide a new correlational analysis of the leading elements of Buddhist thought and practice, for the early period, which were eventually fused into "Chan Buddhism." An important finding in this research is that the way existent perceptions were integrated by Japanese and Korean writers reveal a logic consistent with that of Chinese precedents regarding their sense of legitimacy. Here the benefit of using non-Chinese sources is that it shows that before the construction of a Chan school, the concerns that fed into this school reached beyond China and indeed had their impact in the absence of any school organisation: lineage and precepts in Japan and Korea. Only by reconsidering the sources from outside China do the characteristics of Chan Buddhism as a cross-cultural transmission become truly intelligible.

Historiography of Chan Studies

Some fundamental questions regarding earlier stages of the formation of the Chan School have not been answered satisfactorily. The greatest difficulty

in studying Chan history comes from the nature of Chinese sources. Firstly, the development of Chan Buddhism over several centuries resulted in an organic religion which cannot possibly fit into any static definition without considering the differences in particular phases. For instance, the ideas and vocabulary that Mazu and Zongmi presented are fairly different from earlier writings of Chan Buddhism in the sixth and seventh centuries. Secondly, as Chinese Buddhists have been practising historians since the third century, persistent reconstruction in Chan histories does not surprise us. Most printed sources in China have been modified or expanded since their first occurrence, given that they were regarded as important scriptures and selected into the canon. For Chan Buddhism in particular, it is obvious that the accounts of transmission are full of imagination and fabrication. Multiplicity of ideas of meditation and masters were incorporated freely under a loose "Chan" label. The definition of "Chan" is as puzzling to modern scholars as it was to ninth century Buddhists, who already began sorting out the contradictions by making classifications.

Scholars of Chan Buddhism are aware of the problem of historicity of the sources, thus, it is natural that the approach of historical revision has become well-established in current studies. For the revisionists, biographies and lineage accounts are narratives which demand critical reading and analysis of their structures. If read carefully, the hidden agenda and discourse can be discerned and therefore, located in the historical context. As a result, we are now cautious of the assumption of any "essence" of Chan and have a greater awareness of the secular aspect of Chan Buddhism, which was not immune from time and space. Specifically, institutional connections and political circumstances are important factors in the formation of Chan Buddhism. Influenced by the critical perspectives

taken by Yanagida Seizan and Sekiguchi Shindai since the 1970s, Bernard Faure, John McRae and T. Griffith Foulk have all made important contributions to this historicist tradition. The most recent representative works include Alan Cole's (2009) *Fathering Your Father* and Morten Schlütter's (2008) *How Zen Became Zen*. These two studies of Chan Buddhism in the Tang and Song Dynasties attempt to clarify the mechanism of the formation of Chan Buddhism in different periods.[1] As their main task is the demythification of histories written by medieval Chinese Buddhists, their approach could be termed a radical historical revision.

Dispite the merits of the revisionists, they have seldom consulted observations outside China which might bring us a step forward. This perspective of Chan history remains blank in current scholarship. As T. H. Barrett exquisitely expounded in the section on "History" in *Critical Terms for Study of Buddhism*, historians should rethink the notion of "cultural time," the evaluation given to human activity against the backdrop.[2] Although a comprehensive attempt at describing Buddhism has been made in the *Encyclopedia of Religion* in 1987 by Frank Reynolds and Charles Hallisey, where religions are regarded as unfolded across time and space, no recent work has bettered this approach. (Barrett, 2005a: 135)

---

[1] Recently reviewed by James Robson (2011), "Formation and Fabrication in the History and Historiography of Chan Buddhism," in *HJAS* 71.2 (2011), pp. 311-349.

[2] T. H. Barrett (2005a), 'History,' in Donald S. Lopez, *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 124-142. p. 125.

A cross-cultural framework can be productive for studying Chan Buddhism in both modern and pre-modern periods. As D.T. Suzuki's writings are known to hold a noticeable degree of hidden agenda and nationalist ideology, the same pattern might have existed in ninth century writings which were then studied by Suzuki. Compared to Chan writings of the ninth century, Suzuki's persuasive writing, although brand new in style, exhibits continuity in its logic and ways of thinking. This is because national pride, which was enhanced by encounters and conflicts between cultures, must have begun as early as the beginning of Buddhist transmission across Asian countries. This is the backdrop of "cultural time" in my research, which is conducted with reference to sources in both marginal lands and the cultural centre.

In agreeing with the importance of the "cultural time," this research is conducted by looking for useful, and sometimes contrasting, evidence in Japan and Korea, which serves as an antidote to some problematic Chinese sources. Building on existing scholarship such as that represented by Cole and Schlütter, this research has mainly followed the same historical and philological methods. However, it pushes further to extend the purview of the sources to the texts outside China, which are in the same philology. In other words, it does not confine itself to Chinese sources, but studies Japanese and Korean sources textually and comparatively. When the texts are put together, it seeks to identify themes that belonged to each other and influenced each other. Then these themes of comparative significance are analysed to draw back conclusions to reflect China. This international scope is historically appropriate because the development of Chan Buddhism did not take place at the same pace in China, Japan and Korea. So the comparative view taken here contributes to our

observation of the transformation of Mahayana Buddhism in East Asia. Consistency and continuity in concepts relevant to Chan Buddhism can be found in miscellaneous texts which were formerly regarded as insignificant and of merely indirect value. The sources used in this research include three main types: (i) bibliographies made by Japanese visiting monks; (ii) Chinese and Japanese commentaries to Buddhist precepts; (iii) biographies of Chinese monks and legends related to Chan patriarch Bodhidharma. Among these three categories, this dissertation begins from the Japanese bibliographies which help with a new categorisation of the sources for early Chan Buddhism. All the works we study from the Tang from early Chan works to the *Platform Sutra* tend to stand isolated, mentioning other sources only to attack them. Zongmi groups ideas with a very loose view of Chan, but without the texts he was summarizing we have no idea what texts were classified with what other texts. Only the Japanese bibliographies actually put books with books, allowing larger patterns to be seen at an earlier point, and as a result, they bring out the importance in the early stages of precepts as well as meditation, which was written out of Chinese histories. However, all three categories are equally important for examining and confirming each other. In so doing, this research combines all sources for a reliable picture of emergent Chan Buddhism up to the ninth century. The result is a new view of the formation of Chan Buddhism and new definitions of the image of important Chan patriarchs such as Bodhidharma.

Cross-Sectarian Approach

The intellectual confluences and doctrinal affinities imply that Chan Buddhism was part and parcel of a larger Buddhist mainstream and that it should be placed in a broader synchronic context. In relating the forgery of the

Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra (Ch. *Jin'gang sanmei jing*, 金剛三昧經) to the Sinicisation process and the unifying ideology provided by Huayan and Chan doctrines, Robert Buswell points out that there is a remarkable degree of synthesis in the Chan narratives which he terms the "Chan ideology."[3] He suggested that a broader perspective for Chan/Zen studies is desirable, because the Chan discourse which accompanies the Sinicisation process in China is matched by a similar pattern in Korea and Japan which displays the same intention and method. The pursuit of unity and high status is in some sense analogous with the ideology of monarchy in the political system. The monarchy being inherently authoritarian penetrated Buddhist discourses on a cross-cultural scale with ideals such as the sequence of Chan lineages, the charisma of Bodhisattva kings and the humane king. When we move to the international level, the motive of attracting imperial patronage exists in all three countries, and the self-image shaped by cultural encounters is reflected in all the Chan-related discourses.

If such synthesis was a strategy to maximise its appeal, so too was the rhetoric of lineage invention. As Schlütter eloquently states:

> "The entire lineage prior to the Song is best understood as a mythical construct, a sacred history that served to legitimize the Song Chan school and its claim to possess a special transmission. Even in the Song, the Chan lineage was subject to constant manipulation and reinterpretation in order to legitimize the lineages of certain masters and their descendents or to bolster polemical and religious claims." (2008: 15)

---

[3] Robert Buswell (1989), *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: the Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Chan lineage as transmission of authority is a main theme in most studies of Chan history. On the other hand, we should remember that the invention of lineages was not exclusive to Chan Buddhism; Tiantai and Huayan had their distinctive lineages as well. Both Cole and Schlütter had to begin the discussion from the earliest lineage transmission within the Tiantai tradition, especially the invention by Guanding (561-632). The claim to possess an uninterrupted lineage all the way back to the Buddha was shared by many other Buddhist groups mentioned above.

This Buddhist rhetoric was shared by a larger cultural sphere in Tang China. In recognising the reality that Chan Buddhism emerged from an intellectual background where ideas of Chinese Buddhism were rather fluid, some scholars have encouraged taking up a broader view of seeing Chinese Buddhism as a whole. For instance, an article by T. H. Barrett (1992) took a cross-religious approach to the study of Li Ao's 李翺 (c. 772–c.836) *Fuxing shu* 復性書 (c. 800 C.E.). By bringing Confucian, Buddhist and Taoist parallels into the discussion, he shows that the influence of the intellectual environment, in which influential writers often adopted syncretic approaches for different purposes, is of primary importance in understanding any Tang figure's thought and concerns. The Chinese tendency to freely borrow and incorporate terminology drawn from various sources implies the insufficiency of a single sectarian approach for the study of religion in the Tang.

During an early stage of the formation of Chan Buddhism, influences of other branches of Buddhist learning should be taken into account, such as the Tiantai, Huayan and Three Sects schools. Hence, it is understandable that Cole (2009) leans heavily on the work of Linda Penkower, Koichi Shinohara, Chen

Jinhua and Jamie Hubbard for his inquiries about sixth century Chinese Buddhism. However, there were significant lacunae in his treatment of the possible connections between Chan and Tiantai traditions. (Robson 2011: 329) Probably Cole is not the only one encountering the difficulty of sufficiently consulting cross-sectarian texts. Once the sources are categorised into those that are Chan writings and those that are not, the task of getting rid of the framework of "the" Chan School while selecting one's research materials is increasingly difficult. Perspectives outside "the" Chan School have not been treated sufficiently in present-day scholarship. Even though it is difficult to take account of all philosophical trends which conceivably had some kind of influence on Chan Buddhism, a cross-sectarian approach is still to be commended for Chan studies. This research therefore ventures to make use of materials from outside the Chan repertoire and reevalutes doctrinal affiliations between Chan and other sects.

Preview of Arguments

Before getting into the detail of specific phases of the research, Chapter One provides first of all a critical, if grateful review, of the secondary literature to date, mainly in English, Chinese and Japanese. The second part of Chapter One takes up certain important concepts which can easily turn into pitfalls, the most important ones being *zong* 宗 and *chan* 禪. Third, the relevant ninth century Japanese bibliographies of works sought or collected in China will then be introduced carefully, since they provide the important additional primary source material which was indicated briefly. Just as "Chan Buddhism" is characterised by its famous patriarchs and lineages, it is notable that the Japanese sources develop their own characteristic use of the concepts of "precepts" (for ordination)

and "lineage" (for transmission), and so to prevent later confusion, these will also be considered here in a preliminary way. After these varied but crucial prolegomena, a brief survey of the subsequent chapters is provided for the guidance of the reader.

We come now to a brief overview of the more detailed studies which are set out below. Following an analysis on Japanese bibliographies which reveal a connection between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* two chapters are devoted to the role of these scriptures in the wider intellectual and political context. One of them focuses on the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* in relation to the rise of Chan ideal figures, and the other on the Bodhisattva Precepts in relation to the emergence of the *Platform Sūtra*. Both scriptures served functions in the acquisition of authority in the "latter Dharma" period, and as is well known, Bodhidharma was also brought into the lineage at some point in time. Nevertheless, the link between these two texts was effaced after the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* was attacked by Shenhui, and consequently this aspect of Chan Buddhism is not seen in Chinese sources. In Chapter Two, it is suggested that the rise of the Chan ideal may have had multiple impetuses such as pessimism about the "latter Dharma" (末法 Ch. *mofa*, Jp. *mappō*), the attraction of the ascetic power of meditation masters and interest in the possibility of sudden enlightenment. The ascetic power of meditation masters, which has claimed attention since the inception of Buddhism, was also thought to arise from adherence to the vinayas in the case of theoretically purified practitioners. In sixth century China, anti-scholasticism unified the discourse on "real practice", and this in a sense reinforced coalitions of Chan and Vinaya. Anti-scholasticism within Chinese Buddhist monasteries was the underlying logic that explains the tension between

Chan proponents and the Huayan School and other exegetical monks. The Chan ideal gained influence when meditation and sudden enlightenment came together in the rhetoric of immediacy which accounts for the success of the *Platform Sūtra* and the Sixth Patriarch Huineng by the followers of Shenhui.

Chapter Three explores how changes in the social and political environment demanded new interpretations of existing precepts, and how this was related to the emergence of the new religious ideology called Chan, as presented in the *Platform Sūtra*. Despite the fundamental role of the precepts, the significance of the underlying theme of Bodhisattva Precepts within the development of Chan Buddhism has been overlooked. The evidence presented in this research, however, shows that, at an early stage, the formation of Chan Buddhism evolved from vigorous debates on the Bodhisattva Precepts. Thus this study aims to provide a revision of the formation of Chan ideology in the light of the Chinese reworking of Mahāyāna precepts.

Chapter Four discusses the continuing synthesis of Chan and precepts in China and Japan. All the Chinese monks' teachings on emptiness, "threefold learning", meditation and "perfect precepts" were integrated into Saichō's compact term, *endon kai-jō-e*. The coalition of meditation and precepts is fundamentally the same as in the Chinese "threefold learning" and Tiantai's "perfect precepts." These doctrines were meant to provide new interpretations of theories of enlightenment and hence provide a discourse on legitimacy. Bodhidharma as an authoritative figure was used in various ways by the Japanese Tendai monks, even though their understanding of Bodhidharma is consistent with that of other Japanese monks.

Chapters Five and Six probe the theme of "Dharma flowing east", which emerged around the sixth century and then took shape in the reincarnation story concerning the Japanese prince Shōtoku Taishi 聖徳太子 (573-621) in the early eighth century. The legend was finalised in the ninth century by Kōjō 光定 (779-858), Saichō's important disciple, in his *Denjutsu Isshinkaimon* 伝述一心戒文, in which the lineage of Bodhidharma is a crucial source of legitimacy. Similarly, in the Silla Kingdom of the late ninth century, Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn 崔致遠 (857-?) strove to incorporate the elements of the ideal image of Chan so as to turn Silla into a future Buddhist state of the centre. Thus the ambition of supplanting China's central position by using Chan Buddhism turned out to be a continuing process. In their various ways, these diverse voices of ninth century Chan Buddhism reveal a sense of legitimacy which is tightly linked to the process of the domestication or acculturation of Buddhism in the countries of East Asia. It is due to this that Chan became a crucial channel of cultural transmission in East Asia, while at the same time Chan elements entered the Shōtoku Taishi legend and the biographies of Korean patriarchs. A particular feature in the early development of Korean *Sŏn* (*Chan*) was the popularity of the *Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra*, which is only known in Chinese, and the use of this sūtra symptomizes Korean participation in the sinicisation of Buddhism. In general, this sinicisation of Buddhism, in the train of its reception from India, continued to be the driving force in its transformation during this period, and Chan was part and parcel of the mainstream. The correlation between this process of domestication or acculturation and the formation of Chan Buddhism was a crucial force in the dynamics of the ninth century Buddhism in East Asia as a whole, and without this context the formation of Chan itself cannot be properly understood.

In conclusion, this research is about the paradoxical relationship between the transmission of “enlightenment” “from mind to mind” and the persistent role of precepts, lineage lines including patriarchal figures such as Bodhidharma and Huineng, and various institutional perceptions including international and political ones. The result is a redefinition of the ways in which Chan Buddhism functions, and the approach of Chan to the acquisition and assertion of authority. After consulting sources from China, Japan and Korea, conclusions are drawn to reflect the situation in China in particular. All the texts are analysed for their contents and also comparatively. Themes that belong to each other and influenced each other can then be identified as follows: a sense of crisis, the reworking of precepts and lineage construction. What I argue is that the Chan school before the ninth century was not as distinctive as was once thought; rather, it was much more diffuse. Although there were groups and communities having shared ideas, these ideas were quite fluid and still undergoing a process of integration up to the tenth century. Yet when the Chan school’s self-definition was fixed, some features that had been important in an earlier stage were forgotten. Therefore, this thesis has also become a study of how Chan began. Meanwhile, it brings in new elements for discussion and redefines the figure of Bodhidharma. The Japanese and Korean views provide perspectives that have not yet been consulted by modern scholars, but that are valuable for showing how early Chan emerged from the reworking of precepts stimulated by a sense of crisis in transmission, as well as from the transformation of Mahayana Buddhism in China.

Chapter One

Literature Review

1. The secondary literature on early Chan studies

In order to introduce new perspectives, one of the starting points of this dissertation has to be a survey review, however brief, of studies on the Chan School during the Tang Dynasty (618-907). Scholars have come to believe that the history of Chan was largely constructed retrospectively during the Song (960-1279), creating a "golden age" of Chan in the Tang. Current studies on the history of the Chan School are based on a variety of genres of Chan literature, including lineage accounts, lamp records, and encounter dialogues or recorded sayings (*yülu* 語錄). Were these accounts literature or history? The notable debate between the two protagonists Hu Shih 胡適 (1891-1962) and D.T. Suzuki (1870-1966) represented classically two opposite positions toward the issue.[4] To Hu Shih, Chan was merely a religious movement as an integral part of the political history of Tang, whereas to Suzuki, historians are reductionists failing to see how Zen transcends history in China and Japan. Both of these viewpoints now seem inadequate. Suzuki's attitude is essentialist, and ignores, even despises history. Hu Shih on the other hand failed to give adequate recognition to the religious

---

[4] Hu Shi (1953), "Chan/Zen Buddhism in China: Its History and Method", in *Philosophy East and West* 3.1 pp. 3-24. D. T. Suzuki (1953), 'Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih', in *Philosophy East and West* 3.1, pp. 25-46.

character of the documents out of which the history of Chan Buddhism must be written.

Based on the lineage accounts, there are ample studies of the patriarchal traditions of early Chan Buddhism. There was an evolutionary process in the production of this category of secondary literature on Chan. An early attempt at such studies was made in Yanagida Seizan's (1967) *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* and his essay collection on the "Record of Dharma-Jewel Through the Generations" (Ch. *Lidai fabao ji*, 歷代法寶記, ca. 776) by the disciples of Master Wuzhu's 無著 (714-774) and Lamp Records.[5] About the same time, Philip B. Yampolsky translated the *Platform Sutra* from the text of Dunhuang manuscript.[6] Also, studies on Bodhidharma (c. 530, Ch. *Putidamo* 菩提達摩) in Chan literature have been done by Sekiguchi Shindai and Bernard Faure.[7] Even though the sixth century work "Account of the Transmission of the Dharmapitaka" (*Fufazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因緣傳, T 50: 297a-322b) claimed a line of Indian patriarchs, it is generally believed in current scholarship that the Chinese

[5] Yanagida Seizan (1983a), "The Li-Dai Fa-Pao Chi and the Ch'an Doctrine of Sudden Awakening", trans. by Carl W. Bielefeldt, in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press, pp. 13-50; (1983b), "The 'Recorded Sayings' Texts of the Chinese Ch'an School", trans. by John R. McRae, ibid, pp. 185-205.

[6] Philip B. Yampolsky (1967), *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch: the Text of the Tun-huang Manuscript, translated, with notes*, New York, Columbia University Press.

[7] Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大(1957) , *Daruma Daishi no kenkyū* 達磨大師の研究, Tokyo: Shunju sha. Bernard Faure (1986a), 'Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm', in *History of Religions* 25. 3, pp. 187-198.

patriarchal tradition took shape during the seventh to eighth centuries.[8] A lineage of wordless, sudden and esoteric transmission is mentioned in the epitaph for master Faru 法如 (638-689) (Ch. *Tang Zhongyue shamen Shi Faru chanshi xingzhuang* 唐中岳沙門釋法如禪師行狀) written during the late seventh century. It claims a succession running down from Bodhidharma to Faru, the latter being Hongren's 弘忍 (601-674) heir. Following the basis of the lineage in Faru's epitaph, the biographies of these patriarchs arranged in a sequence can be detected, at the earliest, in the two 'histories' of the Dongshan School, Jingjue's 淨覺 (683- c.750) "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters" (Ch. *Lengqie shizi ji* 楞伽師資記, 712-716 A.D.) and Du Fei's 杜朏 "Record of the Transmission of the Jewel of Dharma" (Ch. *Chuan fabao ji,* 傳法寶記), which were both written during 710 – 720 A.D. This development of lineage construction continued in Shenhui's 神會 (684-758) "On Determining Right and Wrong" (Ch. *Ding shifei lun,* 定是非論) and in the "Record of Dharma-Jewel Through the Generations" disciples in Sichuan Province. The purpose of the authors of the latter was to dispute a rival claim in the "Chronicle of Materials of the Lanka Masters" by fabricating the story about Wuzhu's possession of Bodhidharma's robe. Successively, the "Biographies of the Precious Forest" (Ch. *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳), compiled by an obscure monk named Zhiju 智炬 in 801, is regarded as a proof of a distinct patriarchal tradition. John McRae and Bernard Faure have provided complementary researches on the history of the Northern

[8] For the "Account of the Transmission of the Dharmapitaka", see Wendi L. Adamek (2007), *The Mystique of Transmission: On an Early Chan History and Its Contexts,* New York : Columbia University Press, pp. 101-110.

School.[9] According to McRae (1986: 238-241), the *Platform Sutra* compiled by a member of the 'Ox-head' was meant to resolve the crisis precipitated by Shenhui's campaign. The "Southern School" began to establish sectarian consciousness by setting the Northern school under attack as a scapegoat. According to Faure (1997:11), the patriarchal tradition is "a product of people on the margins, the result of their desire to become the party of the orthodox." Recently, in Alan Cole's study on Tang Buddhists' innovative use of texts to legitimate the maintenance of monastic elites, he found parallels between Tang court politics and authorial invention.[10] Differing from the majority of Chan studies, Cole manages to break the framework which limited the focus to one text or master. By taking all lineage narratives into account he establishes an overview of the dynamics of lineage creation. This study contributes to the re-definition of the patriarchal tradition of Chan, but unfortunately leads to a generalised and simplified view of the nature of Chan Buddhism. Competition for authority and politics alone cannot explain the contemporary need for new doctrinal interpretations, and the characteristics of the ideas of Chan are left disregarded.

In order to understand the shift within early Chan tradition, Yanagida (1967, chapter 6) traces changes in the images of patriarchs in the lineage accounts from the "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" (Ch. *Xugaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳) to the previously mentioned "Biographies of the Precious

---

[9] John McRae (1986), *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. Bernard Faure (1997), *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*, translated into English by Phyllis Brooks, Stanford, Calif : Stanford University Press.

[10] Alan Cole (2009), *Fathering Your Father: The Zen of Fabrication in Tang Buddhism*, California: University of California Press.

Forest": from the bodhisattva monk Bodhidharma in the former text to the magical power he possessed as described in the latter text. The change in the image of Bodhidharma, from an Indian monk to a Chinese patriarch, is an indicator of the formulation of Chan Buddhism. According to Yanagida, the link between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices" (Ch. *Erru sixing lun* 二入四行論) in the biography of Bodhidharma in the "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks", was in fact imposed by the author Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667). Hence it hints at the shift in attitudes toward these two texts. The rise and fall of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* help to distinguish various phases in the development of Chan Buddhism: from Jingjue's "Chronicle of Materials of the Lanka Masters" until Shenhui replaced it with the *Diamond Sūtra*. Jingjue emphasised the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* yet failed to explain its connection with the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices." Moreover, Yanagida also pays attention to the relationship between Chan Buddhism and the reform of Mahāyāna precepts. His matchless knowledge of various types of Chan literature greatly facilitated our understanding of the nature of Chan writings.

Nevertheless, the question of the relationship between "Chan" and the "Chan School" persists. It remains a perennial question for scholars of Zen and Chan studies, as does the question of the position of the first Chan patriarch Bodhidharma. Giving a partial answer to this question, T. Griffith Foulk argues that we cannot speak of a '*Chan* sect' or even "Chan" in general before the early ninth century.[11] He suggests that there was a widely accepted myth about the

---

[11] T. Griffith Foulk (1987), *The "Ch'an School" and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition*, PhD dissertation, University of Michigan. Especially pp. 164-5, 229-44.

lineage transmitted from Mahākāśyapa to Bodhidharma, but diverse groups claimed to be the legitimate heirs. Even the efforts made by Shenhui and Zongmi were no more than individual attempts. In order to maintain a distinction between the lineage running down from Bodhidharma and the doctrines about meditation, Foulk separates the '*Chan'* (school) and *dhyāna* (meditation practice) by referring to the former as the 'Buddha Mind Lineage'. However, the replacement name still stands for the lineage of Chan, and the separation of meditation and the Chan School cannot help in defining "Chan" before its meaning had a fixed formulation. Even though the scholars above have noticed the problem of multiplicity of representatives in the Chan tradition, the concept of *the* Chan lineage is still dominant due to the limits of the sources *within* the Chan tradition. The studies of the lineage accounts and patriarchs have limits for helping us to define the early Chan tradition before the ninth century, but they are helpful for our understanding of the social and religious context.

The enthusiastic writing of the lineage accounts reflected a general anxiety regarding the transmission of Buddhism during the seventh to eighth centuries, as has been recognised in the secondary literature. For example, Wendi Adamek's (2007) study on the "Record of Dharma-Jewel Through the Generations" and its composers, the Baotang School, reflected a broader social and religious transition. The "Record of Dharma-Jewel Through the Generations" reveals an underlying contradiction in Chan thought: a need for authorised Dharma transmission stands in contradiction to the interdependence of lay Buddhists and the ordained. The contradictions between the precepts and antinomianism, and between spiritual virtuosity and non-conceptualisation, imply the existence of ideological battles during the time when the text was produced. Devotional Buddhist practices, such

as the Bodhisattva precept ceremonies, repentance ceremonies and merit accumulation activities, began to increase in popularity from the fifth to sixth centuries up to the eighth century. This type of devotional Buddhism was precisely what Master Wuzhu of the Baotang School attempted to subvert. Accompanying the increasing importance of lay participation during the eighth century, the interaction between the *sangha* and the state was significant during that time. (Adamek 2007:16) The notions of the "end of the dharma" and "crisis in transmission" created a mounting sense of crisis among Chinese Buddhists in the eighth century. (Adamek 2007:11) In responding to it, different types of remedies were espoused, such as ritual and exegetics in the Tang, and material Buddhism in the Northern Wei. Adamek discusses five types of response to the feeling of crisis: 1) utilisation of chronology of Indian Dharma transmission; 2) Zhiyi's classification; 3) state protection rituals based on the "Benevolent King Sūtra" (Ch. *Renwang jing* 仁王經); 4) Xinxing's inexhaustible treasury; 5) Daoxuan's visionary ordination ritual (see Adamek's Chapter Five). It is under this broader context that a need to clarify the stream of true dharma transmission was one of the formative tensions that shaped the early Chan School.

Eighth Century China

It cannot be over-emphasised how significantly the political situation affected Buddhist activities in medieval China. Monks such as Shenxiu 神秀 (606? - 706) who received imperial patronage resided in the capital cities Luoyang and Chang-an; even Shenhui who advocated recognition of a remote Buddhist patriarch was also based in the capital. However, the An Lushan (安祿山) Rebellion in 755 resulted in a decentralised power distribution from the central

court to provincial governments, and this in turn changed the centralised pattern of Buddhist activities. Buddhist migrants fled to outlying regions in the southern and southeastern provinces where they enjoyed patronage from local officials. Seven years of warfare in the two capitals, where Faxiang, Huayan, Tantrism, and Northern Chan emerged and grew during the Tang, led to a disruption of these scholarly Buddhist traditions; on the other hand, Chan and Pure Land gained in popularity from then on.[12] This event was also the factor that contributed to the eclipse of Shenhui's Heze (荷澤) faction while the power was shifting to the Regional Military Governors, known as the *Jiedushi* (節度使). Soon afterwards, there appeared an early Chan chronicle, the "Record of Dharma-Jewel Through the Generations", composed by Wuzhu's disciple in the then remote Sichuan province, indicative of the fact that active Buddhist communities clustered together in distant regions. The success of Chan masters in Sichuan and southeast China supports Albert Welter's observation of Chan ascendancy in relation to the political patronage.[13]

The historical circumstances of the Tang affected Chinese Buddhism in various ways, such as the involvement of Chan masters in reforming Buddhist ordination. Warfare seriously affected the base of Buddhist clergy: in order to meet military expenditure in the shortest time, the court began to sell ordination certificates to anyone who wanted to be ordained. This policy not only had a hand in the debasement of the quality of the clergy but also played a part in the

[12] Stanley Weinstein (1987), *Buddhism under the T'ang*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 61-2.

[13] Albert Welter (2006), *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: the PoliticalAscendancy of Chan Buddhism*, Oxford : Oxford University Press, p. 32.

confrontations about Buddhist precepts at the religious and political levels. (Weinstein 1987: 59-61) Precepts and regulations had always played significant roles in institutional Buddhism and reformulation based on the *Vinaya* had been the Chinese clergy's concern. During a time when Buddhism was regarded as being in decline, it cannot be overlooked that eagerness for reforming the ordination platform increased. This is probably why both Daoxuan and Shenhui had ventured to reform the ordination platform.[14] Hence it is not a coincidence that the *Platform Sutra*, which emerged possibly in early ninth century, declares itself associated with ordination platforms.[15] The *Platform Sūtra* was probably composed partly out of an intention to reform the clergy, and Shenhui in fact regarded himself as a reformer of the Buddhist clergy rather than the founder of any sect. (McRae 2005) Meanwhile, there was indeed an overlap of identity with some monks conceiving themselves as being a Chan monk and a Vinaya master simultaneously. (Yanagida 1967: 198) Taken together, the driving force of the formulation of the Chan School came from various origins in the political and religious context and cannot be seen as a self-conscious movement.

Huineng

John Jorgensen's study of Huineng 慧能 (638-713) furthers our understanding of the religious context by documenting several features of the

---

[14] John McRae (2005), 'Daoxuan's Vision of *Jetavana*: the Ordination Platform Movement in Medieval Chinese Buddhism', in William M. Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya,* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

[15] Barrett, T. H. (2005), 'Buddhist precepts in a lawless world: some comments on the Linhuai ordination Scandal', in William M. Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya,* Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press, p. 116.

Chan scene in the eighth century.[16] The first is internal competition due to geographical factors, a centre-peripheral competition in the name of the South-North division, even though the 'Northern school' was in the first instance constructed as a rival by the Southerners, in Shenhui's writing. The success of the Dongshan (東山) School in the North provoked Shenhui's sense of rivalry and the invention of a figure by the name of Huineng in the distant South. Nevertheless, Shenhui was in fact based in the capital in the North, so this is an example which illustrates how a peripheral image was used by someone at the centre (Jorgensen 2005: 669). Following An Lushan's rebellion (755/56), monks fled into peripheral areas. During the late eighth century, when Buddhist writers in different parts of China produced the "Biography of Master Caoxi [i.e. Huineng]" (Ch. *Caoxi dashi zhuan* 曹溪大師傳), the rejection against the centre, the capital, is visible in all of them. The second aspect is the cult of relics versus the cult of books. Jorgensen takes the "Biography of Master Caoxi" as representing the cult of relics, and the *Platform Sūtra* as the cult of books. On the other hand, the disappearance of the "Biography of Master Caoxi" indicates a decline of relic worship among the aristocracy and monks drawn from the literati. The third aspect is the marriage of Indian and Chinese elements in hagiographical writing. Indian elements refer to the cult of relics and the traces of Buddha and Bodhidharma, which were combined with Confucian style of biographical writing in Huineng's story. Jorgensen's observation could be applied to other Chan patriarchs for the mechanism is rather similar.

Mazu

[16] John J. Jorgensen (2005), *Inventing Hui-neng, the Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch'an*, Leiden; Boston: Brill.

During the latter part of the eighth century, according to Yanagida (1967), the Chan tradition transited from Early Chan to Classical Chan. Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709-788) and his Hongzhou (洪州) faction opened up a new phase of Chan Buddhism. Both Mario Poceski and Jinhua Jia suggest that Mazu's immediate disciples propagated his teachings.[17] The influence of the Hongzhou faction prevailed throughout China, particularly its iconoclastic and antinomian tendencies, although Mazu's antinomianism and lack of discipline were criticised by Nanyang Huizhong 南陽慧忠 (?-775) and Zongmi on account of their concern over the possible further implications of such radical teachings. Mazu's philosophy was rooted in the concepts of *tathāgatagarbha* and *prajñāpāramitā*, and is known for the expression "the ordinary mind is the way" (平常心是道). The important idea of "this mind" refers to the pure and tranquil Buddha-nature (即心是佛).

However, the issue regarding Mazu's disciples' self-conscious identity of belonging to a specific lineage or a greater Chan tradition divides the two authors again. Jia states that these disciples had exclusively a Mazu school identity and therefore endeavoured to rule out other sects from the orthodox genealogy. On the other hand, Poceski states that these disciples had two compatible identities, that of one specific lineage and that of a greater Chan tradition; Chan's expansion resulted from loosely organized individual behaviour rather than a centrally

[17] Mario Poceski (2007), *Ordinary Mind as the Way: the Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*, Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press. Jinhua Jia (2006), *Hongzhou School of Chan Buddhism in Eighth- Through Tenth-Century China*, Albany, NY : State University of New York Press.

organised strategy. It is precisely this discrepancy that gives rise to the inconvenient question regarding the so-called Hongzhou 'lineage' of the time. One might further ask whether the identity of a distinct lineage was really as clear as Jia and Poceski suggest. There are several problems regarding the two authors' presuppositions. First, Mazu's disciples probably regarded themselves simply as being someone's disciple, rather than speaking for any 'school' or lineage tradition. Second, it was common for such disciples to receive instruction from several masters, who were also said to be founders of other sects. Moreover it is difficult for us to judge which master should be regarded as their main teacher, the one they spent the longest time with or the one which influenced them the most. It therefore seems difficult to claim that they regarded themselves as being of 'one' lineage only.

Zongmi

Zongmi, a scholar monk associated with both the Chan and Huayan traditions, represents the culmination of Buddhist intellectual innovations of the Tang. Zongmi developed his own system of doctrinal classification, on the basis of his reading on the "Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna" (Ch. *Dasheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論). He clarified the connection between the Southern School and *tathāgatagarbha* thought, while in the meantime he also devalued the links between the Northern School and the Yogācāra and between the Ox-head School and the Madhyāmika.[18] At the centre of Zongmi's ontology is the existence of the originally awakened "one-mind" understood as the "*tathāgata*

[18] Peter N. Gregory (1991), *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. pp. 224-30.

womb" (*tathāgatagarbha*). In the tradition of Chan, the position taken in the first instance by the Northern Chan, is that one should polish away the impurities that obscure the mind, while Zongmi argues that the impurities are "nothing but a manifestation of the intrinsically pure mind as it accords with conditions". (Gregory 1991: 223) Although Zongmi seems to have had an antinomian position similar to that of the Hongzhou's school, he criticized the latter's lack of concern with enlightenment, which was regarded by him as an epistemological phenomenon. Zongmi's schism, by presenting this doctrinal debate, refutes the Hongzhou sect in order to defend his own Heze line. Zongmi's networking with the Tang literati was an important factor in his success. It is remarkable that after he was officially honoured by Emperor Wen (r. 826-40) in 828, he began to compose the "Chan Chart" and "Comprehensive Preface", shifting his target from Buddhist scholars to the court and the literati. (Welter 2006: 34-38) His idea of Chan influenced later Buddhists of the Song Dynasty especially in the composition of so-called "Record of Lamp Transmission." [19] Nevertheless, Zongmi's classification of Chan Buddhism and synthesis of the Huayan doctrine tell us more about his own purpose than that they give a truthful picture of Chan Buddhism during the early ninth century. Inconsistencies occur when we compare Zongmi's writing with earlier Chan writings and with Japanese records of the same period.

---

[19] T. Griffith Foulk (1999), "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," in *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds., Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Honolulu: University of Hawai`i Press, pp. 220-294, especially p. 233.

In studies on important Chan masters such as Mazu and Zongmi, we usually find a problematic assumption: namely that a self-conscious Chan School had already been formulated in the ninth century. However, if Mazu and his disciples already represented a predominant Chan School, why did Japanese visiting monks not take it up at once? Given that Chan texts are mentioned in the bibliographies by Japanese visiting monks, notably Saichō, Ennin 円仁 (794-864) and Enchin 円珍 (814 – 891), *the* "Chan School" of the ninth century seems to be distinctive enough as a lineage, but at the same time obscure enough to be incorporated freely with other traditions.[20] Medieval Japanese monks' writings about their understanding of the Tang Buddhism can provide important comparative perspectives, yet it has not been treated sufficiently in current scholarship. For example, even though Saichō claimed a Chan transmission from China, Saichō's idea of the Chan School is generally neglected, except in the study by Funaoka Makoto, and more recently, Sueki Fumihiko's article about Zen during the Nara period in which he traced the Zen transmission up to Saichō.[21]

---

[20] These three monks who visited China have attracted major studies. For a detailed study of the life of the Japanese Buddhist monk Saichō, credited with founding the Tendai school in Japan, see Paul Groner (1984), *Saichō: the establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, Seoul : Po Chin Chai. For a study of Ennin's life, see Saeki Arikiyo **佐伯有清** (1989), Ennin **円仁**, *Nihon Rekishi Gakkai henshū* **日本歴史学会編集.** Tōkyō : Yoshikawa Kōbunkan. For an excellent study on his travel in China, see Ono Katsutoshi **小野勝年 (**1964-1969**),** *Nittō guhō junrei gyōki no kenkyū* **入唐求法巡禮行記の研究.** Tōkyō : Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan. For a study of Enchin's life, see Saeki Arikiyo (1990), Enchin **円珍,** *Nihon Rekishi Gakkai henshū* 日本歴史学会編集**.** Tōkyō : Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

[21] Funaoka Makoto 船岡 誠 (1987), *Nihon zenshū no seiritsu* 日本禅宗の成立 ,

The above revisionist scholarship has provided a solid foundation for our knowledge of Chan Buddhism in the Tang Dynasty, but the fundamental question as to the nature of Chan for the earlier stage remains unclear. Two problematic matters emerge from the foregoing literature review: the first is that of discussing Chan Buddhism under a framework of "the" Chan School; the second is that of analysing Chinese Buddhism without including the perspectives from Japan and Korea. These misperceptions have led to the false assumption of a self-conscious Chan School, particularly as Mazu and Zongmi's writings tend to provide such an impression. It is therefore a major feature of the current thesis that it seeks to bring the attention of scholars to the whole range of different sources on the Japanese and Korean side which are valuable for comparison with the Chinese materials.

Yanagida Seizan holds a similar view regarding the sources for Chan studies. In talking about the value of the *Zutangji* 祖堂集, (Jp. *Sodōshū*. Kor. *Chodang chip*), Yanagida mentions that through the *Zutangji* as well as other Chan texts from Dunhuang and Korea, the fresh voice of Chan Buddhism when it was still young can be heard.[22] He suggested that in order to read these texts divorced from tradition, untouched texts without commentaries were needed, and the Dunhuang and Korean materials fit this requirement perfectly. (Yanagida 2001:

Tokyo : Yoshikawa Kobunkan. Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 (1997), "Nara jidai no zen" 奈良時代の禅, in Sueki Fumihiko, ed., *Zen to shisō* 禅と思想, Tokyo: Perikansha, pp. 77-108.

[22] Yanagida Seizan (2001), "Passion for Zen: Two Talks at the San Francisco Zen Center", translated and introduced by Urs App, in *The Eastern Buddhist* XXXIII, 2 (2001), p. 69.

72) Because the *Zutangji* had disappeared and had not been read by anyone, it escaped being subject to alteration. In all of the later Chan histories, beginning with the "Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Lamp" (Ch. *Jingde chuandenglu* 景德傳燈錄), the hands of editors and publishers played a role in making them compatible with the goals of the nation. (Yanagida, 2001: 89) I would venture that in fact, the Japanese materials used in the current research, including the bibliographies, could be read in the same light. When Paul Demiéville's research in *Le concile de Lhasa* told us that the origin of Tibetan Buddhism was connected to early Chan, research on early Tibetan Buddhism restored a moment of historicity to the Chan movement in its land of origin, China. However, this Chinese movement can also be seen in Korea and Japan. (Yanagida 2001: 79) The history of early Chan showed a breadth that could not be sufficiently grasped and interpreted by a single national tradition. Rather, a comprehensive view of the development of Chan can only be gained by looking at it from outside China as well as within.

2. "*Chan*" (禪) and "*Chan zong*" (禪宗)

The word *zong* (宗) in Chinese Buddhism does not match the expression "religious school" in modern senses. According to Stanley Weinstein, when the term *zong* first appeared during the fifth century, it did not mean a "school." [23] For example, *zong* refers to "doctrines and theses" in Tanji's 曇濟 "The Discourse on

[23] Weinstein, Stanley (1989), "The Schools of Chinese Buddhism", in *Buddhism and Asian History*, Joseph M. Kitagawa, ed., New York: Macmillan; London: Collier Macmillan, pp. 257-267.

Seven Theses of Emptiness" (Ch. *Qizong lun* 七宗論) written in 470. Kumārajīva's enormous translation project had a great impact on Chinese Buddhism in initiating the exegetical tradition; from then on, *zong* refers to "underlying themes" in Baoliang 寶亮 (444-509) and Jizang's 吉藏 (458-522) exegetical works. Similarly, *zong* in effect means "Buddhist doctrines" in the context of Huiguan 慧觀 (468-537) and Fazang's 法藏 (643-712) doctrinal classification (*panjiao* 判教). *Zong* in a sense of fully fledged schools emerged at the earliest in the eighth century, and then only for a few Buddhist groups, such as Tiantai and Huayan. It would be inappropriate to regard Esoteric and Chan Buddhism as religious schools in the full sense until even later.[24]

Just as the word "*zong*" underwent an evolutionary process so too did the word "*Chan.*" (Yanagida, 1967: 437-446) As is well known, *chan*, pronounced in Japanese as *zen*, was originally a transliteration of the Sanskrit word *dhyāna,* which literally means the practice of meditation. Relevantly, *samādhi* (Ch. *sanmei* 三昧) refers to the state which one attains through practicing *dhyāna*. The importance of meditation increased within Buddhist communities during the fifth century but the contemporary concept of Chan master (*chanshi*) was not yet fixed.[25] Two types of Chan master were contrasted in terms of the representative

---

[24] T. Griffith Foulk suggests that it was not until the tenth century that an overall entity which could be called the Chan School really came into existence. (Griffith 1987: 164-5, 229-44.)

[25] Robert Sharf (1992), "The Idolization of Enlightenment: On the Mummification of Ch'an Masters in Medieval China", *History of Religions* 32.1 (1992), pp. 1-31, for the terminological implication of **"**Chanshi**",** see pp. 5-6.

figures Kumārajīva (343-413) and Buddhabhadra (359-429).[26] Both of their biographies are preserved in Huijiao's 慧皎 (497-554) "Biographies of Eminent Monks" (*Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳), and their contrasting images illustrates the emergence of ideal Chan figures. Kumārajīva's meditation techniques were called "Bodhisattva Chan" and became quite fashionable in Chang-an. Although both of them were products of the Sarvāstivāda School, Buddhabhadra had a lineage to support his orthodoxy. Because of this difference, Buddhabhadra's meditation teaching gained more followers than Kumārajīva's during the fifth to sixth centuries. Huijiao's judgments on Kumārajīva and other eminent monks show that the concept of "monastic life" refers to the practices of meditation and adherence to precepts. (Lu 2004: 42) What the success of Buddhabhadra tells us is that to Chinese Buddhists, the ideal Chan master should be an adherent of precepts and meditation, and have a legitimate lineage.

It still remains unclear precisely to what extent and by which time, the terminology of "Chan" and "Chan School" were settled. Since the practice of meditation was not exclusively restricted to the "Chan School", scholars have made attempts to separate the usage of "Chan" from the "Chan School" before the Song Dynasty. Teachings on meditational techniques developed in the Tiantai School earlier than in the 'Chan School.' In some cases, it is likely that the word "*Chan*" was actually highlighted in the Tiantai School before the ninth century while in the meantime a variety of groups were claiming the lineage of Bodhidharma.

---

[26] Lu, Yang (2004), "Narrative and Historicity in the Buddhist Biographies of Early Medieval China: The Case of Kumārajīva", *Asia Major Third Series* 17.2 (2004), pp. 1-43.

The term '*Chan zong*' existed before the transmission myth from Mahākāśyapa to Bodhidharma was developed. In the "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks," however, the '*Chan zong'* lineages were described slightly differently from the later Chan lineage accounts. Daoxuan listed several systems of meditation learning during the Sui and Tang periods, such as the Tiantai system, the Sheshan Sanlun (攝山三論) system, and others.[27] However, it seems that Daoxuan did not regard these different systems as coming from any distinctive lineages. Although relations between masters and disciples are mentioned, it shows no attempt to trace the origin of these meditation systems back to any Indian masters. Furthermore, Yanagida (1967:446) notices that Daoxuan wrote "*Chan zong*" in the three biographies of Huisi 慧思 (514-577), Zhishou 智首 (567-635) and Baogong 保恭 (542-621). Huisi was the earliest monk among them while Baogong was the one closest to the strand of tradition of Bodhidharma (*Damo xi* 達摩系). In James Robson's study of Nanyue, this mountain proved to be a famous meditation centre where Tiantai, Chan and Daoist monks studied

[27] Meditation practitioners formed sizable groups during this time. For example, Huiwen 慧文, the master of Huisi 慧思 (515-577), in the Northern Qi, brought several hundred monks to Mount Song 嵩山. Huisi and some forty disciples moved to Nanyue. Daoxin 道信 and Hongren 弘忍 settled down in Huangmei with five hundred other monks and opened up the Dongshan School. Another remarkable community is the Shenshan Sanlun founded by Sheshan Huibu 攝山慧布(518-587). After a historically dubious meeting with the Second Chan Patriarch Huike 慧可, he established a "meditation hall" (*chan fu* 禪府) in the Qixia si 栖霞寺 during the Zhide Era (583-586) of Chen Dynasty. (T 50, No. 2060: 512c)

meditation from each other.[28] This means that "*Chan zong*" could be a common term referring to any teachings on meditation, and that Bodhidharma was not necessarily the central figure or regarded as the first patriarch. Taken together, neither '*Chan*' nor '*Chan zong*' in these early sources was exclusively dedicated to *the* "Chan School".

Even Bodhidharma's teachings are moulded later. According to Yanagida (1967: 437-445), the link between Bodhidharma and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* was fabricated; on the contrary, it was *prajñā* thought that constantly appears in the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices" by Bodhidharma. Since Huisi's master Huiwen was also a master of Madhyāmika, the Chan systems of Huisi and of Bodhidharma were quite similar. Tiantai and Chan monks shared the same resources in learning meditation, and Huisi's teachings were absorbed by Zhiyi as well as the later "Chan School". In this sense, the later Chan lineage was simply *a* lineage among several similar systems of Dharma transmission. It should be noted however that neither Zhiyi nor Huisi mentioned a lineage of meditation tradition of their own. During this early stage, they freely referred to and incorporated many other meditation systems for the sake of systematizing Buddhist teachings of similar kinds. This implies that, in the early stages, Chan-related terminology was often borrowed and shared by various schools. Considering that the earliest usage of "*Chan zong*" was ascribed to Huisi in Daoxuan's "Continued Biographies for Eminent Monks", it seems the word

[28] James Robson (2009), *Power of Place: The Religious Landscape of the Southern Sacred Peak* (Nanyue 南嶽) *in Medieval China*, Harvard University Press.

"*Chan*" was initially designed for the Tiantai School more than for the 'Chan School'.

In summary, regarding the facts that: a) the Chan-related terminology was loosely used by both Chan and Tiantai Buddhists; b) the attempt of doctrinal classification by Zhiyi and Zongmi implies unsettled Chan-related teachings; c) the origin of the 'Chan School' was identical with Huisi's meditation thought, we can see that there was not yet a distinctive 'Chan School' to be differentiated from others. It is therefore all the more important, if we wish to understand the dynamics of the creation of Chan tradition, to consider a variety of sources and not to restrict ourselves to those which only later came to be regarded as representing the 'Chan School'.

3. Japanese Perspectives

The study of the reception of Chan in Japan provides a significant perspective for the understanding of its development in China. For example, Saichō's use of *Chan*-related terms provides some clues about his perception of '*Chan*', which in turn reflects back on to the usage on the continent. In his works, however, '*Chan'* is sometimes represented as a Tiantai designation. For example, the term '*zenmon shikan*' (禅門止観) refers to the meditation teaching of the Tiantai School.[29] '*Zenkyō*' (禅教) refers to the meditation teaching transmitted

[29] DZ 3: 347, *Ehyō Tendai shū* 依憑天台集. This text is generally accepted as authentic. The original text reads: 自發軫南岳。弘道金陵。託業玉泉。遁跡台嶺。三十餘載。盛弘一乘。止觀禪門。利益惟遠◦義同指月◦不滯筌蹄◦…

from Huisi to Zhiyi.[30] Other relevant terms such as *zenshū* (禅宗, DZ f: 122), *zenmon* (禅門, DZ 1: 161) and *zensha* (禅者, DZ 4: 1), all refer to meditation practitioners under the Tiantai system. There is, however, a mention of the Second Chan Patriarch Huike of the '*Zenshūge*' (禅宗家).[31] The evidence shows that Saichō was using the term '*Chan'* loosely for both Tiantai teachings and Chan Buddhism. The last term to be discussed here, by no means the least in importance, is "Buddha mind"(Jp. *busshin*, 仏心), which appears throughout the Tiantai literature. It is very interesting to note that "Buddha mind" was connected with the precepts (*kaitan* 戒壇 and *kaitei* 戒体) frequently.[32] There are also mentions of "Buddha mind" that hinted at its connection with both *chan* and *samādhi*, both meaning meditation.[33] Many of these types of usage, occurring in works attributed to Saichō, show the connection between the 'Chan School' and precepts in connection with the notion of "Buddha mind."

Enchin once discussed the meaning of the 'Zen School' (*Zenmonshū*). In his "Summary of Similarity and Difference between the Teachings of All Buddhist

---

禪門止觀。及法華玄。但約觀心敷演。可謂行人之心鏡。巨夜之明燈也。自古觀門。未之加矣。

30 DZ 1: 376, *Tendai Hokkeshū gakushōshiki mondō* 天台法華宗學生式問答. This text is generally accepted as authentic.

31 DZ 5: 317. The original phrase reads: 禪宗家第二祖慧可禪師.

32 DZ 1: 493; DZ 1: 636.

33 DZ 5: 387 (佛心，以心授心); DZ 5: 86 (佛心三昧); DZ 5: 285 (佛心常住內證). All of these texts were probably not written by Saichō, but were still composed relatively early during the mid-Heian.

Schools" (*Shoke kyōsō dōi ryakushū* 諸家教相同異略集, T 74: 310c- 313b), he answered questions about 'the Zen School' as follows:

> The contents of teachings (*kyōsō* 教相) of this School [of Zen Gate (*Zenmonshū* 禪門宗)] are not discernible. It is only known that it is based on the *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra,* the *Prajñā Sūtras* and the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra*. Its principal doctrine is "mind itself is Buddha", and its bodhi (enlightenment) is "non-attachment of mind".[34]

This passage shows that Enchin's understanding is identical with Shenhui and Zongmi's teachings in its mention of the *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, which is slightly different from Saichō's idea of *Chan*. However, Enchin was not sure what this *Zenmonshū* teaches. Similarly, in Annen's (841-889?) "Discussion of Teachings and Times in Esoteric Buddhism" (*Kyōji jō* 教時諍), there is a mention of the nine Japanese schools. (T 75: 355a-b, 362a-b. T 80: 5c – 6a) From high to low in superiority, they are: *Shingon* 真言, *Busshin* 仏心 (*Zen*), *Hokke* 法華, *Kegon* 華厳, *Musō* 無相 (*Sanron*), *Hossō* 法相, *Bini* 毗尼 (*Ritsu*), *Jōjitsu* 成実 and *Kusha* 倶舎 Schools. Although there was already a "*Busshin*" School existing in Japanese monks' minds during Annen's time, it hardly defined itself.

In supporting his Tendai precedents, Eisai 栄西 (1141-1215) regarded Zen as dependent on strict precepts. In the *Kōzen gokokuron* 興禅護国論 (fasc. 2:

[34] T74, No. 2368, 312 c. (問: 其宗教相何。答: 未見立教相旨，唯以金剛、般若、維摩經而爲所依，以即心是佛而爲宗，以心無所著而爲菩提。)

49-53), he argued that the “Vinaya-supporting Zen” (*furitsu zen* 扶律禅) had been an important component of Tendai but was lost until he reintroduced it from China. (Bodiford, 2005:196) According to Dōgen 道元 (1200-1253), in 1189, when Xu’an Huaichang 虚庵懷敞 (Jp. Koan Eshō, d.u.) transmitted the Chan lineage to Eisai, he pronounced that, “Bodhisattva precepts are to the Chan School the circumstances of the single great matter.”[35] The underlying logic is clear, namely that Tendai saw Zen as allied with precepts.[36] Eisai and Dōgen’s comments are in accordance with Saichō’s deliberate syncretistic approach (ie. *enmitsu zenkai* 圓密禪戒) which arose after his return from China. Overall, there is a continuous tendency from Saichō to Dōgen for their perception of Zen to be affiliated to precepts. This perception is consistent in the categorisations within their bibliographies which will be discussed below.

Japanese Bibliographies

In China, doctrinal classification in the bibliographies is especially valuable during the period of the introduction of Buddhism. During the fourth century, Chinese catalogues represent the efforts of Chinese monks to distinguish authentic Sanskrit scriptures from pseudo-translations, as well as to make

---

[35] (*Bosatsukai wa zenmon no ichi daiji innen nari*. **菩薩戒**禅門一大事因縁。) *Dōgen zenji zenshū* 道元禅師全集, 2 volumes, Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969-70, vol. 2, pp. 290-291. Quoted in Bodiford (2005: 197).

[36] This view was deeply rooted in medieval Japan judging from the frequent mention of bodhisattva precepts in Zen contexts during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. See Bodiford, 2005: 196-206.

doctrinal classifications.[37] Similarly, the Japanese monks' bibliographies also demonstrate an attempt to absorb new knowledge of Chan Buddhism, which might have remained fragmentary to them. In this light, the bibliographies exemplify the passage of the transmission of Buddhist knowledge. For this reason they are the most expedient guides for studying the cross-cultural transmission of Buddhism. Moreover, Buddhist monks' bibliographies, if studied in the light of the classifications used, provide a guide into the contemporary doctrinal affinities and intellectual confluences of Chinese Buddhism. This is particularly relevant to the question as to how Chan Buddhism was differentiated from other traditions.

For the Japanese monks' classification of scriptures and doctrinal differentiations, we focus on the grouping of Chan texts in the bibliographies of Saichō, Ennin and Enchin. The first catalogue discussed here is Saichō's "Catalogue of Scriptures Acquired in Yuezhou by Dengyō Daishi" (*Dengyō daishi shōrai Esshū roku* 傳教大師將來越州錄, T55, No. 2160), which was composed in 805 A.D. The scriptures Saichō acquired in Yuezhou cover a range of doctrinal traditions, including Tiantai, Huayan, Chan, Vinaya and Esoteric Buddhism. The largest section comprises the Tiantai scriptures, and a remarkable amount of space is devoted to his collection of descriptions of the utensils and mantras for esoteric rituals. While giving priority to Tiantai and Esoteric Buddhism, Chan texts outnumber those of the Huayan and the Vinaya. This

[37] The very idea of a classification of books or a bibliography is Chinese rather than Indian; cf. Woo Kang (1938), *Histoire de la Bibliographie Chinoise*, Paris, and Michael Pye (1990), *Emerging from Meditation*, Tominaga Nakamoto (1715-1746), translated with an introduction by Michael Pye, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 36-38.

prioritization confirms his eagerness about acquiring legitimate transmission, as narrated in the preface to the catalogue. He reports on two types of transmission that he received in Taizhou and Yuezhou: the empowerment ceremony (Ch. *Guan'ding*, Jp. *kanjō* 灌頂) by Master Shunxiao **順曉**, and then the conferral ceremony for two vehicles' precepts.

Saichō's categorization of the Chan and precept scriptures is noteworthy. First of all, the "Passages and Sentences of the Bodhisattva Precepts" (*Pusajie wenju* **菩薩戒文句**) in one fascicle is not placed immediately next to the vinaya texts, the "Commentary of the *Vinaya* in Four Parts" (Ch. *Sifenlu chao* **四分律鈔**) at the very end of this catalogue. Instead, this scripture of Bodhisattva precepts is followed by several Chan-related texts. (T 55, No 2060, 1059b.) It lists the following scriptures:

菩薩戒文句一卷
西域大師論一卷[38]
看心論一卷[39]
無生義一卷[40]

[38] "Treatise by the Master of the Western Region" (*Xiyu dashi lun*) by Xuanzang 玄奘 (602-664).

[39] The "Treatise on Guarding the Mind" (*Kanxin lun*) is also recorded in other catalogues as "Treatise on Observing the Mind" (*Guanxin lun* 觀心論), probably written by Shenxiu.

[40] "Meaning of Non-Production" (*Wusheng yi*).

雙林大士集一卷(二十紙)[41]
曹溪大師傳一卷[42]
絕觀論一卷[43]
法華經名相一卷[44]
青面北天陀羅尼法一卷
般若心經略疏一卷
達磨系圖一卷[45]
佛受苦決義一卷(十五紙)
法性章一卷(加青辨量判斷一卷十紙)

So these Chan texts are grouped together right after the treatise on Bodhisattva precepts. On the other hand, some other Chan texts, such as "Inscription for the Six Patriarch of Ox-Head Mountain in Runzhou" (*Runzhou Niutou shan dilu zushi bei* 潤州牛頭山第六祖師碑), "Account of Dharma conveyance in the western

[41] "Collection of the Works by Great Master Shuanglin" (*Shuanglin dashi ji*). The layman *Shuanglin Dashi* 雙林大士, is also known as *Fu Dashi* 傅大士, *Dongyang jushi* 東陽居士 and *Shanhui dashi* 善慧大士. His real name is Fu Xi 傅翕 (497-569). He was once invited by Emperor Wu of the Liang to give a lecture on the *Diamond Sūtra*, and was later revered as a reincarnation of Bodhisattva Maitreya. Hsiao Bea-hui, *Two Images of Maitreya: Fu Hsi and Pu-tai Ho-shang*, PhD dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, 1995.

[42] "Biography of the Six Patriarch Master Caoxi" (*Caoxi dashi zhuan*).

[43] The "Treatise on the Transcendence of Cognition" (*Jueguan lun* 絕觀論), as well as the next "Terms in the *Lotus Sūtra*", has usually been regarded as a work by Farong 法融 (594～657), the founder of Ox-head branch of Chan. Its philosophy is a continuation of the strand found in Bodhidharma's "Treatise on the Two Entries and Four Practices." John McRae (1986), *The Northern School and the formation of early Ch'an Buddhism*, Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press, p. 211.

[44] "Terms in the *Lotus Sūtra*" (*Fahua jing mingxiang*) is written by Farong and hence is regarded as a Chan text here.

[45] "Lineage Chart of the Bodhidharma Tradition" (*Damo xitu*).

state" (*Xiguo fufa ji* 西國付法記), and "Songs of knives and ladders" (*Daoti ge* 刀梯歌), are scattered elsewhere in the catalogue.

From the list above, we find that the "Passages and Sentences of the Bodhisattva Precepts" in Saichō's catalogue is located right at the beginning of the cluster of Chan scriptures. It shows an identifiable connection between Chan texts and the Bodhisattva precepts in his perception. It is also noticeable that the majority of Chan-related scriptures are affiliated to the Ox-head branch of Master Farong. (Sekiguchi 1957: 254) The doctrinal classification here is in accordance with Saichō's commentaries. According to these, the Chan method which came down from Bodhidharma concentrated on the practices of "constantly-sitting samādhi" (常坐三昧), this being the same as "one practice samādhi", and "formless repentance" (無相懺悔), which conforms to the teachings of Hongren and Daoxin 道信 (580-651) but departs from those of Zongmi and Shenhui.[46] Being close to Daoxin, it would not surprise us that Saichō's idea of *Chan* placed emphasis on the doctrine of "one practice samādhi" (一行三昧) based on the "*Great Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* taught by Mañjuśrī" (*Wenshu shuo pore jing* 文殊

[46] Sekiguchi Shindai (1957: 283-284). In this regard, Saichō's understanding of Chan Buddhism represents a contrast with that of Shenhui and Zongmi which would be valuable in discerning the transformation during Daoxin's time. This requires further studies, which are beyond our present scope.

說般若經, T8, No. 233).[47] Therefore, Saichō's grouping of the scriptures makes sense of his Chinese learning of Buddhist doctrines.[48]

Ennin's catalogue is much more organised and structured than that of his teacher Saichō. It includes an increased number of Chan scriptures. Ennin has several catalogues with noticeably different contents. The earliest one, compiled in 838 A.D., is the "The Catalogue of Entering Tang in Search of the Dharma" (*Nittō guhō mokuroku* 入唐求法目錄) , which records the scriptures he acquired in Yangzhou 揚州.[49] In this catalogue, the "Scripture of the Bodhisattva Precepts conferral ceremony" (*Shou pusajie wen* 受菩薩戒文) in one fascicle is followed by "Songs of the Highest Vehicle Buddha-Nature" (*Zuishangsheng foxing ge* 最上乘佛性歌) by monk Zhenjue 真覺, and the "Determining the Orthodox Meaning of the Mahāyāna *Laṅkāvatāra*" (*Dasheng lengqie zhengzong jue* 大乘楞

[47] Cf. Bernard Faure (1986), "The Theory of One-Practice Samādhi in Early Ch'an," in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 99-128.

[48] It is worth noting that Saichō's catalogues were compiled to request funding for the expenditure involved in copying and exporting his collection of materials back to Japan. Since this was the purpose, some of the scriptures were not included in the catalogue of 805. Unfortunately, we do not know how many scriptures known to him were omitted from his catalogues. The selection of scriptures was part of his propaganda, just as the preface of the catalogue emphasises its legitimacy.

[49] *Nihonkoku shōwagonen nittōguhō mokuroku* (Ch. *Ribenguo Chenghe wunian rutang qiufa mulu* 日本國承和五年入唐求法目錄, "The Catalogue of Entering Tang in Search of the Dharma, the Fifth Year of Chenghe Era, Nihon State" T 55, No. 2165, 1074a – 1076b).

伽正宗決). (T 55: 1075b14-16) It shows that, to Ennin, the Bodhisattva Precepts are affiliated to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. The same conception is found consistently in other catalogues by Ennin.[50]

The "Catalogue of Newly Acquired Sacred Teachings on Entering Tang" (*Nittō shingu shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目錄, T 55, No. 2167: 1078b – 1087b), compiled in 847, is the final edition of Ennin's catalogues for the scriptures and utensils collected from Yangzhou, Mt. Wutai and Chang'an during his nine-year stay in China. Firstly, in this catalogue, three editions of the Bodhisattva Precepts of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* are followed by the *Platform Sūtra*.[51] (T 55: 1083b1) Several columns later, the same cluster as mentioned above in his earlier catalogue occurs: the "Scripture of Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral Ceremony", the "Songs of the Highest Vehicle Buddha-Nature", and the "Determining the Orthodox Meaning of the Mahāyāna *Laṅkāvatāra*". (T 55: 1086c5) Here we see again the rationale of the linkage of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the Bodhisattva Precepts. Second, it is also of interest in this catalogue to see the location of the *Platform Sūtra* which follows the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*.[52]

---

[50] The mentions of the "Text of Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral" (受菩薩戒文) in Ennin's bibliographies include: T55, no. 2165: 1104b18 (translated by Amoghavajra); no. 2165: 1075b14; no. 2166: 1077c14; no. 2167: 1086c5. All of these entries demonstrate the affiliation between Bodhisattva precepts and Chan texts on Buddha-nature.

[51] There is no known Sanskrit original for the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* (Ch. *Fanwang jing* 梵網經, T. 1484), though it is putatively referred to as the *Brahmajāla Sūtra*, and it is "apocryphal" in the sense that it was probably composed in China.

[52] This pattern is consistent in with that of other catalogues by Japanese monks (cf. T 55: 1089a 7-8). A possible reason is that both scriptures serve the function of

Judging from the classification in the catalogues mentioned, we can note a stable pattern such that the scriptures regarding the Bodhisattva Precepts are grouped together with the Chan texts. Furthermore, it is noticeable in this catalogue that Ennin put together a treatise by Bodhidharma (*Damo heshang wugeng zhuan* 達摩和尚五更轉) and three scriptures by Master Huisi. (T 55: 1085a) This indicates a looser categorization of patriarchs as between the Chan and Tiantai groups, which became stricter at a later period.[53]

Finally, in 855, Enchin composed the "Catalogue of Sūtras, Vinayas, Commentaries, Accounts, Non-Buddhist Scriptures and Other Items Obtained in Fuzhou, Wenzhou and Taizhou" (*Fuzhou, Wenzhou, Taizhou qiude jinglulun shuji waishudeng mulu* 福州溫州台州求得經律論疏記外書等目錄).[54] This is

---

giving instruction on ordination ceremonies with reference to the doctrinal principle behind the precept conferral rituals.

[53] The similarity in the implications of the images of Huisi and Bodhidharma will be given fuller consideration below when it comes to their reincarnation legends.

[54] (T55, No. 2170, 1092c – 1095c) This catalogue by Enchin is divided according to the places the author visited. So on the one hand the doctrinal categorization in his catalogue may be disrupted, but on the other hand here is the advantage that the dimension of geography is helpful for further research. One interesting fact about the regional factor is that Enchin seems to have been most interested in the Chan materials when he was in the Kaiyuan Monastery, Yongjia County, Wenzhou (溫州永嘉郡開元寺). According to Suzuki Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄 (1985, *Tō godai no zenshū* 唐五代の禅宗, Tokyo: Daito shuppansha), Wenzhou did not have a community of Chan Buddhists until the tenth century. One wonders how and why Enchin acquired so many Chan scriptures there. Unlike Ennin, Enchin spent more time in southern China, and his collection of Chan materials is the largest among the three monks mentioned. Ennin's catalogue includes at least 11 scriptures of Chan tradition, and yet Enchin collected more than 41 works. (Sekiguchi 1957: 255)

particularly important for it includes the largest number of Chan texts, and was composed just after his fresh cultural exchanges in the regional monasteries. There are two features of his grouping of the Chan and precept scriptures to note here. Firstly, in this catalogue, two scriptures relating to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* (*Lengqie aba duoluo baojing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經) are followed by the "*Vinaya* in four parts" (*Sifenlu* 四分律). (T55: 1093c.11-13) Secondly, the "Mahāyāna Method of Offering" (*Dasheng busa fa* 大乘布薩法), the "Manual of the Precepts for the Bodhisattva's Mind-Field" (*Pusa xindi jie ben* 菩薩心地戒本) and the "Songs of Seeing the Nature" *(Jian daoxing ge* 見道性歌) are grouped together. (T55: 1093c20-25) The connection between mind and precepts is again identifiable in Enchin's classification.

Enchin later composed "The Comprehensive Catalogue of Enchin Entering Tang in Search of the Dharma" (圓珍入唐求法總目錄 T55, No. 2173) in 858 for the benefit of his patrons. In this final edition of his bibliography, all the Chan masters and Bodhidharma are grouped together, (T55: 1106b15-c25) the *Platform Sūtra* is just after Bodhidharma's writings, (T55: 1106b19-21) the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* is put together with the *Diamond Wisdom Sūtra* (*Jingang po're jing* 金剛般若經), (T55: 1105b22-c03) some scriptures of the Bodhisattva precepts are found together with Huayan scriptures, (T55: 1105b9-14) and Dharmakṣema's "Bodhisattva Precepts Manual" (菩薩戒本一卷(曇無讖)) is followed by Yijing's 義淨 commentary to the *Diamond Sūtra*. This catalogue

gives the impression that there was a distinctive Chan lineage in Enchin's perception, but the question is whether this lineage really defined *the* "Chan School" for Enchin.

In another bibliography relating to Enchin named "Catalogue of Requests by Chishō Daishi" (智證大師請來目録, T55, no. 2173), there is the text entitled "Account of precepts conferral and the Chan bloodline" (*Shoujie ji Chan xiemai zhuan deng,* 受戒及禪血脈傳等一卷) in one fascicle. (T55: 1107b09) Enchin seems to have gained a more definite sense of the importance of blood-lineage than Ennin, which strengthens his ethnic identity as a Japanese. His perception of blood-lineage is further stated in his "The Illustration and Account of Bloodlines in the Great Tang State and Nihon State" (*Daitōkoku Nihongoku fuhō kechimyaku zuki* 大唐國日本國付法血脈圖記):

> Following the stream to seek for the origin, smelling the fragrance to search for the root. The seven patriarchs of the Great Tang have acquired a bloodline. How could it be possible that the four leaves in Japan have no relevant illustrations and accounts?[55]

It is noteworthy that Enchin contrasted China and Japan with regard to the bloodline tradition in order to stress that Japan should not be considered as inferior to China. It is not difficult to discern a hint of sense of legitimacy in such a comment. This is in accordance with Enchin's acknowledgement of a distinct

[55] *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* (BZ)114: 301a. （挹流尋源、聞香討根。大唐七祖、既有血脈。日本四葉、何無圖記。） The term "four leaves" refers to four strands of Tendai tradition in Japan. The term "bloodline" is also metaphorical.

lineage as expressed in the latest version of his bibliography, in which all the Chan masters are placed together, and lineage records are put before and after the cluster.[56] (T55: 1106b15-c25) Even if there is an awareness of a distinctive name of the "Chan School," his perception of Chan doctrines is fairly loose. This is illustrated by his comment in a different paragraph in his "Summary of Similarity and Difference between the Teachings of All Buddhist Schools":

> There are dhyāna masters in the Schools of the Zen Gate (*Zenmonshū* 禪門宗), Tendai and Shingon … Among these schools, the Zen School has its own origin. … The contents of teachings (*kyōsō* 教相) of this School are not discernible. (T 74: 312c)

The above comment reassures us about the connection between Bodhisattva precepts and Buddha-nature. These two concepts are usually surrounded by a cluster of Chan scriptures in the bibliographies, such as Bodhidharma's writings, the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Diamond Sūtra*. This pattern of classification is consistent in most of the Japanese bibliographies. Enchin's understanding of *Chan* seems to be further developed than that of Saichō. As the collection of Chan scriptures increased from Saichō to Enchin, the category of Chan patriarchs became clearer. Nevertheless, the lineage alone cannot provide a sufficient framework for understanding Chan Buddhism, and this is reflected in Enchin's perplexity. On the other hand, a more distinctive feature is that the construction of

[56] At the front: "Illustration of the Bloodline of the Bodhidharma School" (*Damo zongxi tu* 達磨宗系圖), T55: 1106b19. At the end: "Illustration of the Recollection of the Mahāyāna Bloodline"(*Chongji dasheng xiemai tu* 重集大乘血脈圖), T55: 1106c25.

lineage reflects the need for a cultural identity for the monks travelling in Buddhist countries.

In terms of the doctrinal differentiation in their bibliographies, there is a conspicuous alliance between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the Bodhisattva precepts. The question is then to what extent this alliance represents Chan Buddhism up to the ninth century. In answering this question, the next two chapters below move the focus to the development of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the Bodhisattva precepts in China, through which we can see a hitherto ignored aspect of the relationship between Chan and precepts in the formation of Chan ideology. The combination of Chan and precepts, as the historical evidence shows, was bound up with sense of legitimacy.

4. **Concluding Remarks: Buddhist Precepts and Lineage**

Encounter and Identity

Cross-cultural encounter raised questions of self-image and self-identity for the monks who travelled across countries, and such collective cultural identity was reflected in monastic codes. For example, when Yijing 義淨 (635-713) visited India, his concern immediately shifted to the institutional issues of monastic life, such as hygiene and clothing.[57] Upon his return, Yijing spent most of his time translating the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (根本說一切有部律), in the hope of establishing a better foundation for the

[57] John Kieschnick (1997), *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*, Honolulu (USA): University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 16; 28.

clerical life of Chinese monks. This process of reworking the monastic codes involves doctrinal separation, differentiation and seeking coherence in Buddhist and cultural contexts.[58] The discrepancy in *vinayas* arose in India since the sangha was divided into the *Sthaviravāda* and the *Mahāsāṃghika*, and then six major vinayas were developed and observed by Buddhists. It shows that the monastic regulations were full of contemporary social and political considerations, which naturally differed according to time and region.[59] This characteristic was magnified after multi-cultural encounters and Buddhists began to reflect on their own cultural identity, and expressed it through reworking and/or radical modifications of vinayas. It is noteworthy that each effort of Chinese Buddhists to revitalise vinayas boosted their sense of legitimacy simultaneously.

Institutionalisation through Regulations

The cultural interaction between China and Japan stimulated an awareness which was manifested in the form of institutionalised regulations. In response to an imperial invitation for Vinaya masters, the Chinese master

[58] For the role and concept of Buddhist institutions in the process of separation and integration, see Timothy Brook (2005), "Institution", in *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, ed. by Donald S. Lopez, Chicago: the University of Chicago, pp. 143-161.

[59] Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑 (1999), *Shukke towa nani ka* 出家とはなにか, Tōkyō: Daizō shuppansha. Chapter two. In his analysis of the nature of vinaya, he attempted to solve the puzzle as to how Buddhism could effectively enter Japan while there was a failure to adhere to the vinaya.

Jianzhen 鑑真 (Jp. *Ganjin*, 688-763) took his leave for Japan.[60] He immediately established an ordination platform at the Tōdaiji 東大寺 in Nara. Shortly after that, he conferred Bodhisattva precepts on the imperial clan according to the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, as well as ordination of Buddhist monks according to the "Vinaya in Four Parts." The Japanese court was very keen to institutionalise the Buddhist Order through Buddhist precepts in this period.

The institutional aspect of Buddhist precepts finds its parallel in the political system in Japan and China. Following a thorough survey of how the term "Nihon" was used and pronounced since it first appeared in the documentary reference in the *Kushikiryō* 公式令 during 698 – 670 A.D., Amino Yoshihiko holds that the gradual establishment of the country called Japan began with a strong consciousness of the Tang Empire.[61] The country was built, largely relying on the administrative system borrowed from China into a *Ritsuryō* (律令) state, in which an intense awareness of the Tang court was deeply embedded.[62] The consciousness of self-identity was not only an issue of intellectual history for it had to be implemented by means of institutionalisation, as in the implementation of the *Ritsuryō.* However, the

---

[60] Andō Kōsei 安藤更生(1958), *Ganjin* 鑑真 (688-763), Tokyo: Bijutsu shuppansha. Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿(1973), *Ganjin: sono kairitsu shisō* 鑑真—その戒律思想, Tokyo: Daizō shuppansha.

[61] Yoshihiko Amino (1992), "Deconstructing *Japan*", in *East Asian History* 3, (June 1992), pp. 121-142.

[62] Bruce Batten (1986), "Foreign Treat and Domestic Reform: The Emergence of the *Ritsuryō* State", *Monumentica Nipponica* 41.2 (1986), pp. 93-112.

Ritsuryō foundation crumbled as regional power grew and the central court began to lose its grip from the late ninth century onwards.

During this period, the symbolic meaning of "emperor" differed in China and Japan in accordance with its state ideology. Simply put, the "son of heaven" sufficed in medieval China, whereas Japanese contemporaries went further to claim that the "son of heaven" came from the East, because that is where the sun came from. Japan was east of China and it is probably the consciousness of the existence of a central state which probably propelled the Japanese to come out with a theory linking the importance of the East, the sun, the centre and the Heian court. This period of history reveals the process of the construction of cultural identity in the East Asian countries.

Political history and religious history combined in the issues concerning the institutionalisation of the Buddhist order. Since the introduction of Buddhism in China and Japan, what concerned the religious leaders most in medieval times was the application of monastic regulations through adaptations of *vinayas* and precepts. Representative religious leaders in China and Japan such as Yijing, Daoxuan and Saichō, made enormous efforts in composing commentaries on precepts and ordination. The visions behind monastic codes reflect the self-image of a community. The process of institutionalisation enhanced the self-awareness of communities, and meanwhile, vinayas and precepts were created and modified for identity construction.

Lineage and Authority

Traditions demand authority, and hence lineage construction happens particularly when a new religious society is created. While the establishment of tradition and authority is crucial to the emergence of a new religion, lineages may be also created retrospectively in order to separate from existent traditions. The lineage construction of Chan Buddhism for the sake of transmitting *vinayas* and precepts is a clear example of this. According to Robert Sharf, lineage may be viewed "as an ideological tool wielded in the interests of a new Buddhist hermeneutic – the sudden teaching, mind-to-mind transmission, and so on—that was both controversial and potentially destabilizing."[63] In fact, Chan tradition is one of the clearest cases of the development of this ideological tool. As McRae aptly puts it, it is "not only the Chan School's self-understanding of its own religious history, but the religious practice of Chan itself that is fundamentally genealogical."[64] Interestingly enough, while the role of patriarchs and lineage always appeared as the core of the historical accounts of Chan Buddhism, there existed an anti-patriarch idea which is contradictory to the common understanding of Chan Buddhism. According to Elizabeth Morrison, debates about the function of language and scriptures for the transmission of the Dharma arose in the context of rethinking of the necessity of patriarchs on the part of Chinese Buddhists.[65] As a result we see the attempts to downplay the importance of masters and patriarchs

---

[63] Robert Sharf (2001), *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, p. 41.

[64] John McRae (2003), *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*, Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 8.

[65] Elizabeth Morrison (2010), *The Power of Patriarchs: Qisong and Lineages in Chinese Buddhism*, Leiden: Brill. Introduction, p. 51.

when a pedigree directly linking to the Buddha is guaranteed. In fact, the discussion of the authority of transmission is taken back to the textual resources about rule (*vinaya*) and precept. In the tradition of the ordination ceremony, the authority of the "vinayas and sutras" is placed higher than the "masters," following the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra.* The lineage of the precepts predates Chan lineage, but the evolution of Chan ideas of "non-reliance on words" (不立文字) and "a separate transmission outside the scriptures" (教外別傳) came from the reworking of theories regarding precepts and the ordination platform. It is argued here that the idea of "separate transmission without words and teachings" as an argument against the necessity of scriptures is in accordance with the main idea of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* which was popular in China from the fifth century. The dialectical relation between the transmission theory of Chan and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* explains the logic of Chan lineages. In effect, the more direct approach was developed in the spirit of skilful means, drawing upon the fountainhead of Mahāyāna precepts in a new form which came to be characterised as Chan Buddhism.

Chapter Two

Two Themes in the Rise of Chan Buddhism: The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and Bodhidharma

Given the clue from the Japanese bibliographies about the relationship between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the Bodhisattva precepts, two chapters are devoted to answering the question of whether there is a link between the two sets of texts. The current chapter aims to reassess the relationship between the Chan and *Vinaya* traditions in this wider context, with special reference to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and Bodhidharma, while the subsequent chapter explores the relationship between the Bodhisattva precepts and the *Platform Sūtra*.

It is argued that the connection between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and Bodhidharma traditions seems to have become less identifiable in later stages of the development of Chan Buddhism, but was a core element in the origin of Chan Buddhism. This connection proves crucially important to understanding the nature of original Chan Buddhism which, it is argued, was largely a response to the widespread anxiety about the decline of Buddhism (Ch. *mofa*, Jp. *mappō* 末法) during the sixth century.[66] In the search for authority to transmit Buddhism during

[66] The concept of *mofa* was first introduced to China through Dharmakṣema's (曇無讖, 385-433) translations of the *Dabo niepan jing* 大般涅槃經 (Skt. *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12, no.374. completed in 421 A.D.) and the *Beihua jing* 悲華經 (T. no. 157, completed in 419 A.D.). The most comprehensive survey of the Buddhist concept of decline remains Jan Nattier (1991), *Once Upon a*

the absence of the Buddha, textual and patriarchal authorities were both under scrutiny. The profound conflict between these two led to the reworking of the meditational approach to enlightenment over against the exegetical approach. In order to disentangle the puzzling nature of Chan Buddhism, this chapter traces the relationship between meditation, scholasticism and Vinaya through two themes: the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and Bodhidharma. This text and this patriarch were the essential elements of the earliest Chan lineages. The changing narratives about the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* explicate, intriguingly, how the doctrines associated with *mofa* shaped the needs of new interpretations for meditational practice, and how these were related to the emergence of the patriarchal image known as Bodhidharma. It is interesting enough that the significance of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* waxed and waned in accordance with the changing relationship between meditation and scholasticism. To complicate matters further however, when textual transmission

Future Time: *Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*, Nanzan Studies in Asian Religions, Berkeley, Calif.: Asian Humanities Press. Jan Nattier argues convincingly for an East Asian origin of the three-period system, the “true dharma,” “resemblance dharma” and “final dharma.” (pp. 86-90) She demonstrates that the Buddhist legends of decline are akin to the prophetic literature in Hebrew texts, but the particular “final dharma” (*mofa*) is a unique East Asian variant of “final age” (*moshi* 末世), which corresponds to the Sanskrit term *paścimakāla.* (pp. 94, 284) Hubert Durt, however, regards “eschatology” as somewhat artificial, considering examples of the relativization of the three stages of the Dharma according to the region and the chronology. He deduces that “the ideology of the Dharma progressing eastward (*tōzen* 東漸) implicitly neutralizes the doomed aspect of the *mappō* ideology” as Shōtoku Taishi’s (572-621) time was considered as being in the period of the “true dharma.” Hubert Durt (1994), *Problems of Chronology and Eschatology: Four Lectures on the "Essay on Buddhism" by Tominaga Nakamoto (1715-1746)*, Kyoto : Istituto Italiano di Cultura, Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, p. 44.

predominated, Chinese Buddhists were more in favour of emphasising lineage and patriarchs.

The Northern and Southern Dynasties saw tensions between corruption in the temples and petitions for reformation, which exacerbated the long-lasting debate between scholastic monks in the capital and mendicant monks in the mountains. In such a social environment, the competition between different strands of Buddhist thought was fierce. For mendicant monks, the path to enlightenment relies on practices, namely meditation and the practice of bodhisattva-hood, rather than preaching to emperors and aristocrats. Influenced by the foreign monks from India and central Asia, some of the northern Chinese of the sixth century adopted the idea of asceticism and assiduous meditation practices. By contrast, those of southern China were generally prone to discussing philosophical aspects of Buddhism and exegetical studies of Buddhist scriptures. Under this generalised categorisation, however, the exchange of ideas was quite fluid between northern and southern China. What is common in both regions is the rise of anti-scholasticism following the corruption of monasticism. Meditation practice was advocated through the idealised image of Chan masters in the biographies of eminent monks such as the representative figures Kumārajīva (343 – 413) and Buddhabhadra (359-429) mentioned in the previous chapter. This religious background is the provenance of what may be called the Chan ideal.

Situating the initial formulation of Chan Buddhism against this religious background, we find the influence of the idea of the decline of the dharma on the conception of both Chan and precepts. The distrust of the monastic order was heightened by dramatic events during this period. The famous Liang

Wudi (梁武帝, 464-549) patronised Buddhism in southern China, and the ending of his rule was so unsettling that it prompted reconsideration of the decline of Buddhism. Similarly, Buddhism was greatly patronised and luxurious monasteries were built in the Northern Wei, as described in the "Record of Buddhist monasteries in Luoyang" (*Luoyang qielan ji* 洛陽伽藍記). Despite this flourishing, what followed was the dramatic persecution of Buddhism during 574 - 578 of the Northern Zhou. Even though the positive universalism of the doctrine of Buddha-nature had played a significant part in Chinese Buddhism before the disruption, the Buddhist persecution in 578 confirmed in the minds of Chinese Buddhists the idea that Buddhism was in decline around the sixth century. Despite the conflict between a fateful sense of demise and the universal character of Buddha-nature, the rhetoric of decline gained a dominant place in the Buddhist discourse in China at this time. The fear of decline of dharma is enhanced by the Buddhist persecution. Examples of such responses to the persecution of Buddhism may be seen with Chan master Sengchou 僧稠 (480-560), Bodhidharma, and even (from the Daoist side) in Kou Qianzhi's 寇謙之 (365-448) *Celestial Masters*.[67] On the one hand, if the Buddha-nature is common to all sentient beings (as Mahāyāna teaching often expresses it) its recognition should be timeless, and yet

[67] For historical analysis and the evidence for these figures, see Yanagida (1985), "Goroku no rekishi: Zen bunken no seiritsushiteki kenkyū" 語録の歴史: 禅文献の成立史的研究, in *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方学報 57, pp. 211-663, (reprint as *Zen bunken no kenkyū* 禅文献の研究, *Yanagida Seizan zenshū* vol. 2.), p. 96. See also p. 112 for the contrast between Bodhidharma and Sengchou in Daoxan's biography.

with hundreds of years passing since the teaching of the Buddha himself, there was an increasing sense of distance and of possible decay of the Dharma.

The sixth century is traditionally noticeable for the beginning of sectarian Buddhism in China. Facing crises coming from lack of imperial patronage and persecution, it is not a coincidence that, the prominent "schools" of Chinese Buddhism known as Tiantai, Huayan, Pure Land, and Chan, burgeoned with tensions and competition. As Kawakatsu Yoshio noticed, Chinese began to develop their own collective identities within Buddhism during the period of the Northern and Southern Dynasties.[68] The writings on the transmission of Buddhism substantiated the process of identity construction during the invention of tradition.[69] Consciously or not, therefore, a lineage crystallises the sense of community, and it is not mere coincidence that it begins from this period.

Lineage construction matured in the seventh century when Tiantai and other groups were developing their lines of transmission. Continuing into the eighth century, the formation of various lineages was largely shaped by the

---

[68] Kawakatsu Yoshio 川勝義雄 indicates for Huisi's time a shift from the sense of "myself at the present time and location" 今ここの私 towards that of "our" 私どもの present; see his "Chūgoku teki shinbukkyō keisei he no enerugi- : Nangaku Eishi no baai" 中国的新仏教形成へのエネルギー：南岳慧思の場合 (The Driving Force behind the new Buddhism in China), in Fukunaga Mitsuji 福永光司 ed.,中国中世の宗教と文化 *Chūgoku chūsei no shūkyō to bunka*, 京都大学人文科学研究所, 1982, pp. 501-538, especially p. 502.

[69] Robert Campany drew on Benedict Anderson for the collective imagination of lineages in the Chan tradition. Robert Campany (2003), "On the Very Idea of Religions (in the Modern West and in Early Medieval China)," *History of Religions 42.4,* pp. 287-319. He follows the earlier theoretical formulation in "The Invention of Tradition", Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger, eds., Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983.

contemporary politics among elite monks and their patrons.[70] However not all individual teachers or groups were drawn into such a process, and not every Buddhist group possessed an equal sense of membership among themselves.[71] Against this background, in order not to obstruct the picture of the broader religious context by sectarian boundaries, this chapter draws from primary sources of multiple origin.

The crucial question relating to lineage construction is about the selection of patriarchs: why were these specific figures selected? The answer to this is often that each patriarch has a specific "function" in the line of transmission that the authors of lineage accounts desired to convey.[72] It is a common pattern in Chan and other traditions that the patriarchs are drawn from various strands of Buddhist thought to be the representatives of a particular tradition, a process similar to the highlighting of Nāgārjuna for Madhyamika and Vasubandhu for Yogācāra. In this way tradition and authority were firmly identified with the

[70] For instance, a monolithic transmission was proposed by Shenhui in order to exclude other masters. See Elizabeth Morrison's (2010: 47-50; 54) analysis on Kuiji 窺基 (632-82) and Shenhui for the mechanisms of the construction of lineage. The shift from multi-lineages to monolithic lineages during the eighth century derived from this process too.

[71] Take the community of "Three Level Teaching" for example, the followers of Xinxing (540-594) did not reconstruct their history in the same manner as was done in Tiantai and Chan. In fact the teachings of Xinxing did not even become a distinctive category within the "Three Level Teaching" itself, but remained miscellaneous. See Jamie Hubbard (2001), *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood: The Rise and Fall of a Chinese Heresy*, Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

[72] An expedient theoretical overview for the functions of patriarchs can be found in Michael Pye (1986), "Tradition and authority in Shin Buddhism", *The Pure Land (New Series)* 3, pp. 37-48.

selected patriarchs.[73] Several concepts drawn from various traditions were woven into the tapestry of Chan Buddhism, and similar features could be found in Pure Land and Tiantai. The discussions in this chapter, therefore, aim to provide answers as to why Bodhidharma appears in the lineage, beginning with his image as a patriarch. The elements in his image relating to the Chinese reception of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* will be discussed in the historical context of sixth century China in the later parts of this chapter.

1. The retrospective images of Bodhidharma and Huineng

Bodhidharma is the key figure for the image of Chan patriarchs and the best approach remains Faure's suggestion that we treat Bodhidharma not as an individual but as a kind of textual paradigm.[74] Regarding Bodhidharma's function as a literary trope therefore, the following part concentrates on the questions of how and why he coincided with the trend towards greater importance of meditational practice and on his relationship with the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.

The earliest mention of Bodhidharma is in the "Record of Buddhist monasteries in Luoyang," which was written in 547. It briefly narrates that Bodhidharma, coming from the western region, travelled around various countries and was claimed to be a hundred and fifty years old. Hence the first image of

[73] The meaning of the symbolism of patriarchs is always changing because of the shifting view of history. When it comes to the scope of East Asian Buddhism as a whole, the shifting view is especially conspicuous in the development of Chan Buddhism among the three countries. (Pye 1986).

[74] Bernard Faure (1986a) "Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm", in *History of Religions* 25 (2): 187–198.

Bodhidharma was no more than a mysterious figure who could move across national borders freely. Daoxuan's 道宣 (596-667) "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" composed in 645 and revised in ca. 665 added on the transmission of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* to the biographies of Bodhidharma.[75] In these biographies however the provenance and destiny of this hundred-and-fifty-year-old monk remains mysterious. The method he practised is called the "facing-the-wall contemplation" (*biguan* 壁觀) which consisted of realising "two entries" and "four practices." A number of writings attributed to him are said to have been collected and compiled as the "Bodhidharma's Treatise." (T50: 0551c6-12) According to the biography of Huike 慧可 (487 – 593), who is said to have protected Buddhist scriptures and statues during the Buddhist persecution by the Northern Zhou 北周 (557-581), Huike received from Bodhidharma the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* with a comment that this is the only trustworthy scripture for

[75] For Daoxuan's perceptions of *chan* as a practice and *chanshi* as practitioners, see Jinhua Chen (2002a), "An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China: Meditation in the Life and Works of Daoxuan (596-667)", in *T'oung Pao*, Vol. 88. 4/5 (2002), pp. 332-395. It is instructive to read this in comparison with Eric Greene (2008), "Another Look at Early *Chan*: Daoxuan, Bodhidharma, and the Three Levels Movement", in *T'oung Pao* 94, No. 1-3, (2008), pp. 49-114. Greene argues against Chen that Daoxuan's *Xichan lun* ("Evaluation of the Chan practitioners") seeks to debunk Xinxing's teachings on meditation rather than to refute Bodhidharma, since the latter's followers did not form a coherent group until Daoxin's time. (Greene 2008: 77) Greene further suggests that, given the significant influence of Xinxing in his time, Xinxing's ideas of "*chan*" should be taken into account for understanding the formation of Chan School's ideology. Both studies in combination provide important information about the intellectual background for the early stages of Chan Buddhism.

Chinese Buddhists to practise, despite the fact that it had become “mere words” for some others in China. (T50: 552b20-21) Furthermore, in the biography of Monk Fachong 法沖 (587-665?), the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* is recorded as being translated by Guṇabhadra (394-468) and preached by Bodhidharma, who then transmitted it to Huike. (T 50: 666b2-16) Daoxuan mentions twice the connection between Bodhidharma and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* highlighting the social circumstances. Although the transmission between masters and disciples is evinced in these biographies, it shows no attempt to impose the authority of one lineage among others. The importance of Daoxuan’s narratives lies in the ideas they provided for a primordial image of Chan patriarchs, which were then taken up by Chan Buddhists.

Daoxuan’s interest in the relation between supernatural powers and meditation is clear and consistent in his life and his works.[76] Reading through Daoxuan’s biographies of eminent monks, those who are called Chan masters typically had the characteristics of practising meditation, performing ordination ceremonies, and possessing supernatural power. This idea of an ideal Chan master has remained dominant in Chan circles. The example of Bodhidharma in the Chan repertoire confirms the standard image of Chan patriarchs as possessing supernatural powers, which was a result of practising meditation. Meditation as one form of practice empowers practitioners with purity and potency, which stood out from the approach of exegetic tradition. One can easily draw an analogy with the ways in which Daoxuan and Huisi emphasised the “real practice” of Buddhist

[76] See Robin Beth Wagner (1995), *Buddhism, Biography and Power: A Study of Daoxuan's Continued Lives of Eminent Monks,* Ph. D.Thesis, Harvard University, 1995.

monks, all of which corresponded to the trend of separation of meditation and scholasticism.

Interestingly, the superhuman elements of the figure of Bodhidharma portrayed in Daoxuan's biography were incorporated and expanded into the image of Huineng (638 – 713), who later became the Sixth Patriarch. In Facai's 法才 "Record of Hair-burial Ceremony in the Stupa of Guangxiao Temple" (*Guangxiao si yifa taji* 光孝寺瘞髮塔記), Huineng was venerated for several points which together portrayed the desired image of a patriarch.[77] The first one concerns the legitimacy given by Guṇabhadra, who was said to have come to Guangxiao Temple to establish an ordination platform. The second one is that both Guṇabhadra and Zhiyao 智藥 visited this temple and predicted that Huineng would emerge there as a 'bodhisattva in the flesh' (*roushen pusa* 肉身菩薩, i.e. as

[77] *QTW* 912, p. 9505a. Annotated by Yanagida (1967: 535-537). According to *E'nō kenkyū: E'nō no denki to shiryō ni kansuru kisoteki kenkyū* 慧能研究：慧能の傳記と資料に關する基礎的研究, ed. Ishii Shūdō 石井修道 et al., Komazawa daigaku zenshūshi kenkyūkai 駒澤大學禪宗史研究會, Tōkyō: Taishūkan shoten 大修館書店, 1978, p. 84, this inscription is collected in three sources: *QTW* 912, *Guangxiaosi zhi* 光孝寺志 10, and *Guangdong tongzhi* 廣東通志 229, which are all rather late compilations. The earliest mention of the inscription is not certain yet. According to Yanagida, it was written in 678, but John Jorgensen, judging from this text's usage of "physical-bodied (bodhisattva)" (*roushen* 肉身), disagrees with Yanagida's reckoning of the date and argues that this text probably dates from after 781. See John J. Jorgensen, (2005), *Inventing Hui-neng, the sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and biography in early Ch'an***,** Leiden ; Boston : Brill, p. 271. Despite the fact that the authenticity is questionable, it still reflects the image created for Huineng before the ninth century.

a mummification).[78] In the inscription, the legacy of Guṇabhadra is borrowed from the "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters," which described him as the first patriarch on the basis that he was the one who had translated the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Despite the fact that all other lineage accounts dismissed Guṇabhadra, this rare mention is worth noting. It evidently arises from the idea that supernatural powers were granted to Guṇabhadra through the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and thus ultimately reflect on the status of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* itself. Since Guṇabhadra is effectively credited with the introduction of Mahāyāna doctrines, it does not surprise us that Facai then emphasises the patriarch's attainment of bodhisattvahood. The last mention, by no means of least importance, is the conferral of Bodhisattva precepts on Huineng, which is a concrete manifestation of the transmission of dharma. Precepts Ordination is never absent from the stories about Huineng, and even the famous '*Platform Sūtra*' allegedly attributed to him was held at an 'ordination platform'. From this complex of attributes it is clear that the framework of "threefold learning" covering meditation, precepts and wisdom persisted throughout this time, so the following section is devoted to this concept.

---

[78] Robert Sharf's article illustrates the idolization of the Chan ideal in the notion of Buddhist mummification, and he notices that mummification is a significant element in the image of the Chan patriarch Huineng. Robert Sharf (1992), "The Idolization of Enlightenment: On the Mummification of Ch'an Masters in Medieval China", *History of Religions* 32.1 (1992), pp. 1-31, see p.9 for Daoxin's mummy, p.10 for Huineng and p. 24 Jianzhen. Cf. Marcus Bingenheimer and Justin Ritzinger (2006), "Whole Body Relics in Chinese Buddhism – Previous Research and Historical Overview," *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* No.7 (2006), pp.37-94, especially pp. 70-92 for Huineng.

2. The Threefold Learning

The Buddhist threefold learning (*sanxue* 三學, Skt. *tri-śiksā*), namely the three baskets of precepts (*jie* 戒, Skt. *śilā*), meditation or concentration (*ding* 定, Skt. *dhyāna*; *samādhi*) and wisdom or insight (*hui* 慧, Skt. *prajñā*), is known as the foundation of Buddhist practice.[79] There were debates, however, about the hierarchy of the three. The *Lotus Sūtra* places the perfection of wisdom higher than meditation, and so some Buddhists have regarded wisdom as the most important discipline or "learning" in Mahāyāna Buddhism. The highlighting of the perfection of wisdom coincided with the dominance of exegetics during the fourth and fifth centuries in southern China. Nevertheless, those Buddhist masters who were in favour of the perfection of meditation were discontented with the domination of exegetics, and a reassessment of the balance of the threefold learning occurred during the sixth century. In the Tiantai tradition, the 'perfect inherence' (*yuanju* 圓具) thought preached by Huisi 慧思 (515-577) and then transmitted to Zhiyi 智顗 (538-597) was expounded on the basis of unifying the

---

[79] Note that the term "threefold learning", translated from the Chinese word "*sanxue*" might give a rather sinicised impression. English equivalents for the underlying Sanskrit expression are "three studies" or "three disciplines", referring to those three disciplines which a practitioner should study. Cf. *A Multilingual Dictionary of Chinese Buddhism* (*Mehrsprachiges Wörterbuch des chinesischen Buddhismus*), eds., Christoph Kleine, Li Xuetao, Michael Pye, München: Iudicium-Verl, 1999, Buddhist Studies (Buddhismus-Studien) 3, p. 186. However, for the sake of convenience, the conventional translation "threefold learning" is used in this thesis.

threefold learning, which developed into the teaching of ‘a single mind possesses a myriad of practices’ (*yixin ju wanxing* 一心具萬行).[80]

Among the three ‘baskets’ of Buddhist learning, there was a noticeable coalition between the practices of meditation and precepts: there was a literary tendency which allied meditation practitioners to the practice of precepts so as to convince readers of their supernatural power, especially in the sections entitled “learning meditation” (*Xichan* 習禪) and “spiritual resonance” (*Gantong* 感通) in Daoxuan’s “Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks” (*Xu gaoseng zhuan*). Daoxuan often mentions wonderworking by meditation masters, showing his enormous interest in the potency of meditational practices during his late years. (Yanagida 1967: 7-9) There were consistent adjustments regarding the hierarchy of the threefold learning as reactions towards changes in the social milieu. However, in general, the evidence weighs in favour of the fact that precepts and meditation were developed in tandem with each other since the sixth century, and Huisi is the representative figure in this social context.

3. Huisi, Xinxing and the Rise of *Chan*

As a representative figure for the discussion in this thesis, Huisi is important during the formation of Chan Buddhism in two respects. The first is his idea of meditation which, when linked to the concept of *mofa*, possibly in the

[80] Yanagida (1967: 257). According to Huisi’s biography, Zhiyi was puzzled by this phrase and asked for Huisi’s further explanation regarding the perfection of Buddhism in relation to the perfection of wisdom. (T 50, No. 2060, 563a16/b4.)

seventh century, had a profound influence on the Chan and Tiantai groups. The present chapter focuses on this. The second matter, to be discussed later, is the way in which he came to be quoted in the Chan repertoire. In particular, Huisi became highly important in shaping Shōtoku Taishi's reincarnation story, which will be discussed in Chapter Five. It proves that the Chan and Tiantai Buddhists brought Huisi in to make a lineage point. There was power-broking going on in the construction of lineages, which might not seem important to us now, but was all-pervasive in the seventh century.

This chapter seeks to place Huisi's idea of meditation in his own contemporary religious context, in terms of which the earliest Chan writings should be interpreted. As the "Three Level Teaching" also reflects similar thoughts, it explains why he was so concerned about the decline of Buddhism. Huisi struggled during a distressing historical period, and experienced enormous crises in his life as a Buddhist. According to the biography in Daoxuan's "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks", he was even poisoned by other monks and nearly died as a result. He also described his life and the oppression he suffered from other hostile monks, whom he called "evil exegetics masters" (*elunshi* 惡論師), in his "Proclamation of Vows" (*Lishi yuanwen* 立誓願文), reportedly written when he was forty-four.[81] (T46: 787b9) This indicates a fierce

[81] The full title is: *Nanyue si da chanshi li shiyuan wen* 南嶽思大禪師立誓願文 (Tract on the vow established by the great dhyāna master Huisi of Nanyue), (T46, no. 1933.) The authenticity of this text is doubted by Etani Ryūkai 恵谷隆戒, "Nangaku Eshi no rissei gammon wa gisaku ka" 南岳慧思の立誓願文は偽作か, in *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 6-2 (1958), pp. 524-7.Paul Magnin has followed Etani's suspicion and argued that the concept of *mofa* was not very widespread in Huisi's time. As the earliest mention of the *Vows* is in

competition between Huisi and those who primarily mastered the scriptures. It explains his motivation for emphasising the practice of meditation over against the activity of teaching scriptures.

Huisi's discontent with the clergy was not an isolated case. This becomes quite clear by comparing him with his contemporary Xinxing 信行 (540 - 594), who, very differently, responded to the anxiety of the "final age" with an innovative method of systematisation of Buddhist teachings. A study by Jamie Hubbard focuses on how Xinxing took the opportunity to advocate new doctrinal and institutional configurations.[82] In his case, the rhetoric of the decline of Buddhism resulted in a particular way of conceptualising the special category of "mute sheep monks" within the four-fold *saṃgha* in the monastic rules as Xinxing expounded them.[83] As James Benn (2009: 37) argues, Xinxing's concerns over the promotion of the stupid "mute sheep monks, like the lineages of Chan, look like a particularly Chinese solution to the problem of being located far from the Buddha in space and time." Benn (2009: 28) not only sees the similar

---

Daoxuan's biography of 664 A.D., it is possible that the concept of *mofa* was matured in the seventh century. However, the representation in the *Vows* is significant, so Magnin analysed its thought and translated it as the final chapter of the same book. Paul Magnin (1979), *La vie et l'oeuvre de Huisi*, Paris: École Française D'Extrême-Orient, pp. 104-116; 192-238. On the other hand, Nattier attributes the first fixation of the three-period system to Huisi in 558. (Nattier, 1991: 100, n. 114)

[82] Xinxing did so under the banner of his teaching called "Practice that Arises in Accord with Capacity" (*Duigen qixing fa* 對根起行法). Jamie Hubbard (2001: 17-9).

[83] James A. Benn (2009), "The Silent Saṃgha: Some Observations on Mute Sheep Monks", in *JIABS* 32, no. 1-2, 2009 (2010), pp. 11 – 38.

rhetoric of lineages, but also suggests seeing Xinxing's vision of the "mute sheep monks" as a trend that ran in parallel with Chan's exhortations of "no thinking," "cessation of thought" and "mindlessness" in eighth-century documents found in Dunhuang such as the "Treatise on No Mind" (*Wuxin lun* 無心論) and the "Treatise on Cessation of Thought" (*Jueguan lun* 絕觀論).[84] It is more likely that the ideas of "no thinking" and "cessation of thought" in the Chan tradition came into existence in order to bypass the corrupted clergy, and meditation is one way for a direct link to the Buddha.

The meditation practice taught by Xinxing is called "formless samādhi visualisation" 無相三昧觀 in his "Assorted Rules for Community Regulation" (*Zhizhongshi xufa* 制眾事緒法).[85] "Formless samādhi" corresponds to the idea of "no thinking" just mentioned, and its importance in monastic codes increased later in the Chan tradition, as Chapter Three will discuss. Similarly to Huisi, Xinxing incorporated meditation and repentance for the physical purification of mind, body and speech. Both Xinxing and Huisi followed the *fangdeng* 方等 (penitentiary rite and retreat) rituals from the "Great Expanded Dharani Sūtra"

---

[84] These texts are introduced in Robert Sharf (2002), *Coming to terms with Chinese Buddhism: a reading of the Treasure store treatise*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press ; London : Taylor & Francis, 2002, pp. 47-51.

[85] See Nishimoto Teruma 西本照真 (1998), *Sankaikyō no kenkyū* 三階教の研究, Tokyo: Shunjun-sha. A more recent study of Xinxing's view of meditation is found in Eric Greene, "Another Look at Early *Chan*: Daoxuan, Bodhidharma, and the Three Levels Movement", in *T'oung Pao* 94, No. 1-3, (2008), pp. 49-114.

(*Da fangdeng tuoluoni jing* 大方等陀羅尼經) which became significant particularly in Tiantai Buddhism.[86] It is apparent that Huisi and Xinxing both relied on meditation, repentance, and precepts to provide solutions for the final stage of Dharma.[87] As Hubbard writes,

> What, then, do we make of Xinxing's teachings? Are they as unique and different as usually thought? How well do they fit the general tenor of the times: the belief in the lowered capacity of sentient beings, the need for new doctrines and practices appropriate to those sentient beings, the doctrine of universal Buddha-nature, and the holistic vision of the *Huayan Sūtra* all were widely shared with his contemporaries. So, too, the scriptures on which Xinxing relied: the *Lotus Sūtra,* the *Mahāparinirvāna Sūtra*, the *Huayan Sūtra*, the *Vimalakīrti Nirdeśa Sūtra*, the *Śrīmālādevī-siṃ ha-nāda-sūtra*, and the *Xiangfa jueyi jing*; these were among the most widely quoted scriptures of the day. Likewise, Xinxing's emphasis on the precepts, *dhūta* practice, cultivation of *dhyāna* through seated meditation, repentance rites, and *buddhanāma* liturgies are all representative of, not exceptions to, the monastic regimen of Chinese Buddhism from the sixth century onwards. The same can be said of what little we know of their institutional organization; from the apparent involvement of lay precept groups to the social welfare activity of the Inexhaustible Storehouse, all fits with the trends of the times. (Hubbard, 2001: 223)

The above is consistent with Huisi's teachings: the perfection of wisdom comes from meditation, not from studying Buddhist scriptures. It is an intellectual

---

[86] See Zhiyi's *Fandeng sanmei xingfa* 方等三昧行法 (T46, no. 1940). Daniel Stevenson (1987), *The T'ien-t'ai Four Forms of Samadhi and Late North-South Dynasties, Sui, and Early T'ang Buddhist Devotionalism*, Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.

[87] As this chapter focuses on meditation, the aspect of the emphasis on Bodhisattva precepts and repentance will be treated in the next chapter.

response to the worries over the end of Dharma within Chinese Buddhism. Huisi then furthers his method of meditational practice by incorporating Mahāyāna doctrines. It is curious to see just how and why Huisi became so immensely interested in meditation. According to his biography, he was born in Henan Province in the Northern Wei and received ordination in his dreams. As for his initial interest in meditation, he was at first inspired by the "Sūtra of the most wonderful meditation" 最妙勝定經 (Ch. *Zuimiao shengding jing*; Jap. *Saimyō shōjōkyō*).[88] Then he joined the group led by Huiwen 慧文 in Northern Qi, who had attracted several hundreds of followers during that time. While famous for setting up a large group of meditation practitioners, Huiwen was also known as an exegetics master (*lunshi* 論師) of the "Great Treatise on the Perfection of Wisdom" (*Mahā-prajñā-pāramitā Śastra*, Ch. *Dazhidu lun* 大智度論), hence traces of Mādhyamika Buddhism are to be found in Huisi's works. The "Sūtra of the Most Wonderful Meditation" is cited both in Huisi's and in Zhiyi's works.[89] Huisi, in his "Access to the True Samādhi of All Dharmas", following a quotation

[88] This scripture was lost, but rediscovered at the Dunhuang Cave. It proved to be an apocryphal (non-Indian) text composed during the Six Dynasties and it was popular during 535-545. *Komazawa daigaku zengaku daijiden* 駒沢大学禅学大辞典 1, p. 399. For its influence on Huisi, see Magnin (1979: 31); Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大 (1969), *Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止観の研究, Tokyo: Iwanami, pp. 379-402.

[89] Citations appear in Huisi's "Dharma-gate of the Samādhi Without Dispute" (*Zhufa wuzheng sanmei famen* 諸法無諍三昧法門) (T 46: 629b), *Zhiyi's Smaller Concentration and Contemplation* (*Tientai xiaozhiguan* 天台小止觀; Jap. *Tendai shōshikan*) (T 46: 463a) and the *Sophisticated Meanings of the Lotus Sūtra* 法華玄義 (*Fahua xuanyi*) (T 23: 702a).

of the "Sūtra of the Most Wonderful Meditation", commented that anyone who ever tried to practice meditation, even those who only practised at a preliminary level, was superior to all exegetics masters.[90] This is clearly an argument against another exegetical tradition, which was the "mainstream" during his time. From the extant citations, it seems that the "Sūtra of the Most Wonderful Meditation" also argues for an adjusted correlation of the practices of meditation and wisdom.

Huisi's teachings about meditation can be found in the "Free Consciousness Samādhi" (*Suiziyi sanmei* 隨自意三昧) and the "Meaning of the Chapter on Serene and Pleasing Activities in the Lotus Sūtra" (*Fahua jing anlexing yi* 法華經安樂行義) and the "Dharma-gate of the Mahāyāna Contemplation" (*Dasheng zhiguan famen* 大乘止觀法門).[91] In these texts, Huisi taught about two major types of meditation: the *Lotus samādhi* (法華三昧) and

[90] T 46, No. 1923, p. 629b. The original passage reads: "復次如勝定經中所說。若復有人。…散心讀誦十二部經。卷卷側滿。…不如一念思惟入定。何以故。但使發心欲坐禪者。 雖未得禪定。已勝十方一切論師。"

[91] The authenticity of this text has been doubted. It is included here simply because it is consistent with the other two following texts with regard to meditational teachings. For studies on its contents, see Shengyan 聖嚴法師 (1999), *Dasheng zhiguan famen zhi yanjiu* 大乘止觀法門之研究, Taipei: Fagu wenhua shiye; Matsuda Miryō 松田未亮 (2004), *"Daijō shikan hōmon" no kenkyū* 大乗止観法門の研究, Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin. This scripture was possibly written in China some time during the late seventh to early eighth century. Even Saichō's and Ennin's bibliographies do not include it them. See Daniel Stevenson and Kanno Hiroshi 菅野 博史 (2006), *The Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra's Course of Ease and Bliss: an annotated translation and study of Nanyue Huisi's (515-577) Fahua jing anlexing yi*, Tokyo : International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2006, pp. 48, 52.

the free consciousness samādhi. The *Lotus samādhi*, one of the half sitting half walking samādhi (*banxing banzuo sanmei* 半行半坐三昧) and also known as the three-seven-day samādhi, is explained in the "Meaning of the Chapter on Serene and Pleasing Activities in the Lotus Sūtra." (T46: 697c17-28) The *Lotus samādhi* is designed for Mahāyāna bodhisattvas in accordance with the *Lotus Sūtra.* The "serene and pleasing activities" include activities with attributes (*youxiang xing* 有相行) and activities without attributes (*wuxiang xing* 無相行) as this text states, on the grounds that there are bodhisattvas of lower capacity (*dungen pusa* 鈍根菩薩). Even though in his "Commentary to the Chapter on Serene and Pleasing Activities in the *Lotus Sūtra*", Huisi claimed that he believes the *Lotus Sūtra* teaches 'sudden and perfect teachings of Mahāyāna Buddhism' (*dasheng yuandun* 大乘圓頓) (T46: 697c), he maintained that gradual practices are good for some practitioners. The second type of meditation, the 'free consciousness samādhi,' allied to the 'neither walking nor sitting samādhi' (*feixing feizuo sanmei* 非行非坐三昧), is about the attainment of sudden enlightenment through gradual practices, including techniques of controlling the body, mind and breath.[92] A similar idea appears in his "Dharma-gate of the Samādhi Without Dispute." (*Zhufa wuzheng sanmei famen* 諸法無諍三昧法門. T 46: 633a9-b11) Both of these works recognise the value of the gradual approach, which will eventually

[92] *Dainihon zokuzōkyō* 2. 3. 4, p.346 c12-17.

lead to the realisation that the body has no inherent existence. (Magnin, 1979: 166-178)

In sum, Huisi argues that gradual enlightenment was suitable for the bodhisattvas of lower capacity, while for those of higher capacity (*ligen pusa* 利根菩薩), sudden enlightenment is the path. Since every sentient being has the *tathāgata-garbha*, i.e. the Tathāgata-womb, the matrix of latent Buddhahood, sudden enlightenment is both possible and most appropriate. (T46: 698b) Huisi then brings together ideas about the *tathāgata-garbha*, using as his sources the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* and the *Prajñā* collections. In so doing he claimed that only meditational practices can result in the perfection of wisdom, the supreme practice of meditation is formless, thus producing a synthesis which had a profound influence on the development of Chan Buddhism.[93] He terms this approach of practice the *Lotus Samādhi* (*fahua sanmei* 法華三昧), for it is only through meditation that one can attain wisdom and supernatural power. Since this form of meditation incorporating *prajñā* was so deftly taught by Huisi, the formless practice was well accepted by Chinese Chan Buddhists such as Shenhui.[94] His influence on the Chan tradition is far-reaching. According to Daoxuan, there are hardly any meditation masters who did not follow Huisi's

[93] On the extensive absorption of the perfection of wisdom in both Chan and the precepts tradition see Kawakatsu (1982: 520).

[94] We can find the transition from *Shenxiu's Dasheng wusheng fangbianmen* (大乘無生方便門) to the *Platform Sūtra* as discussed in the later part.

teachings on *Chan* Buddhism, despite the discrepancy between the northern and southern traditions.[95]

Among Huisi's four kinds of samādhi, which were further expounded by Zhiyi in the "Great Calming and Contemplation" (*Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀, T46, No. 1911), the 'Lotus samādhi' and 'free consciousness samādhi' had a direct influence on *Chan* Buddhism.[96] Huisi's "Dharma-gate of the Samādhi Without Dispute" is quoted in Jingjue's "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters."[97] His insistence on a balance between meditation and wisdom found audience among the early Chan Buddhists. For this reason, it is widely accepted by modern scholars that the Northern Chan School adopted Tiantai thought to a remarkable degree, quite apart from which the similarities in the meditation techniques and repentance rituals are striking.[98] In other words, the influence of Huisi's teachings was passed through the anti-scholastic trend associated with the

---

95 (南北禪宗，罕不承續。) T50: 564a.

96 For an analysis about its influence on Chan, see Stevenson, Daniel B. (1986), "The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism", in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, pp. 45-98, especially p. 53. Also Yanagida (1967: 448).

97 T85: 1284a. Here Huisi's thought is identical with Buddhabhadra's theory of the four peaceful minds (*sizhong anxin* 四種安心) quoted in Yongming Yanshou's 永明延壽（704～775）*Zongjing lu* 宗鏡錄, which is strongly influenced by the *Lengqie shizi ji*. See Yanagida (2000: 68).

98 For example, the content of Zongmi's *Zuochan yi* 坐禪儀 is almost identical with Zhiyi's *xiao zhiguan*, whereas Zongmi changed the order of part of the book. See Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大 (1969), *Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止観の研究, Tokyo: Iwanami, p. 272; Yamauchi Shunyū 山内舜雄 (1986), *Zen to Tendai shikan—"Zazen gi" to "Tendai shōshikan" to no hikaku kenkyū* 禅と天台止観--坐禅儀と『天台小止観』との比較研究. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.

rise of the meditation approach. While neither Tiantai nor the Northern Chan School had as yet formulated self-conscious schools, the wider context provides more clues about the motives of Buddhist development, which will be explored next.

4. Anti-scholasticism

In the eyes of Tang Buddhists the practice of meditation, possibly being equivalent to the general notion of practice, relied entirely on strict adherence to the precepts.[99] Purification of mind is the purpose for all practices, and this emphasis on mind matures into the emphasis on "formless precepts" in the 'Southern School.' Despite the fierce debates between the Northern and Southern school, the nuanced difference is simply in the argumentation they made, not in the fundamental doctrinal basis. In other words, the debate between Shenhui and others, as a persuasion to gain patronage, implies room for reinterpretations of "correct" meditation and precepts, which two in combination represent the basis of *practice*.

As the cases of Huisi and Xinxing demonstrate, the intellectual reworking of the relationship between the perfections of meditation and wisdom paved the way for the intricate theory of "formless practice." From then on, during the sixth to ninth centuries, Chan masters from various communities were primarily aiming at refining theories for practice. If the practice is expected to be

---

[99] This is seen for example in the expression "maintaining precepts to settle meditation" (*chijie anchan* 持戒安禪) by Tang poet Wang Wei 王維 (701 - 761). *Wang Wei ji* 王維集 11, Tiemin Chen 陳鐵民, ed., Beijing: Zhinghua shuju, 1997, p. 1085.

formless, how does one assess the practice? Why do they still need "forms" such as repentance rituals and ordination ceremonies? The debates continued for centuries in Chinese Buddhism, and the most notable example, Mazu (709-788), was criticised for his antinomianism. In fact, it was not an idea which originated within Chan Buddhism in the first place, but Chan Buddhism took it up most successfully. The evolution of repentance and ordination rituals, as seen with Daoxin, Shenxiu and Shenhui, informs us of pertinent factors in pre-Chan Buddhism, in particular the long-lasting conflict between meditation and wisdom (*dinghui zhizheng* 定慧之爭), which was mainly a movement against Buddhist scholasticism continuing from Huisi's time.

The origin of this anti-scholasticism was embedded in the debate between Yogācāra and Mādhyamaka throughout the fifth to seventh centuries in China, which was reinforced by the Chinese monks travelling to India. Thanks to the translations by Kumārajīva in Chang-an, the "perfection of wisdom" expounded by Nāgārjuna was well received by Chinese Buddhists, and it remained the mainstream of Mahāyāna Buddhism in China until the introduction of Yogācāra teachings from Vasubandhu (Ch. *Shiqin* 世親, fl. 4th c.). The debate between the two schools shaped the major scholarly disputations within East Asian Buddhism. The effect was profound and far-reaching: Xuanzang's (ca. 602-664) comprehensive translation of the gamut of the Yogācāra scriptures

unmistakably established the superiority of the Yogācāra over the Chinese *Sanlun* 三論 (Mādhyamaka) School, which was already in decline in Tang China.[100]

Doctrinally speaking, the Mahāyāna can be understood as the conjunction of Mādhyamika thought with that of the Yogācāra, because the former provides the "ascending of wisdom" and the latter represents the "descending of compassion" among the qualities of Mahāyāna bodhisattvas.[101] In fact, the yoga-praxis of the Yogācāras inherited the Nāgārjunian notion of emptiness, which is the basis of the theories of the six pāramitās, the ten bhūmis, and so on. (Nagao, 1991: 51) The difference between them, however, comes from the distinction between definitive meaning (*nītartha* 了義) and disputable meaning (*neyārtha* 不了義), which is understood as a contrast between the literal and interpretive. From the Yogācāra viewpoint, the essential scriptures of the school, such as the *Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra* (Ch. *Jieshenmi jing* 解深密經, T 16, no. 676), were written in definitive language, while all the *Prajñāpāramitā*

---

[100] The unsettling argument against scholasticism did not end with Xuanzang's authoritive commentaries; on the contrary, in mid-Nara Japan the debate over definitive meaning and disputable meaning was still an ongoing issue for scholar monks such as Chikō (709-781), when the Sanron and Hossō schools continued to vie with one another. See Ryūichi Abé (2008), "Scholasticism, Exegesis, and Ritual Practice: On Renovation in the History of Buddhist Writing in the Early Heian Periods", in *Heian Japan, Centres and Peripheries*, Mikael Adolphson, Edward Kamens, and Stacie Matsumoto, eds., Univ. of Hawaii Press, pp. 179-211.

[101] Gadjin M. Nagao (1991), *Mādyamika and Yogācāra: A Study of Mahāyāna Philosophies*, ed., collated and trans. by L.S. Kawamura, Albany, N.Y. : State University of New York Press, p. 34.

scriptures, which constitute the textual foundation of the Mādhyamika School, are rendered in less refined, disputable language.[102] The Chan principle of "not relying on words" has a basis in the Yogācāra belief in the ineffability of language which is expressed in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.

In expounding on the Buddhist consciousness, the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* has played a role in counterbalancing the Chinese *Sanlun* School even if only indirectly. The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* draws upon the concepts and doctrines of Yogācāra and the *tathāgata-garbha* tradition, and the most important doctrine issuing from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* is that of the primacy of consciousness (Skt. *vijñāna*).[103] The sūtra asserts that all the objects of the world, and the names and forms of experience, are merely manifestations of the mind. This emphasis on mind activities corresponds naturally to the yogi-praxis of which meditation is one of the major forms.

As a counteraction to the dichotomy, maintaining a balance between meditation and wisdom falls as a task on Tiantai and Chan monks in China and Japan. In their commentaries and treatises, the conception of Buddhist practice refers to Buddhist rituals, diligent meditation and adherence to precepts. In responding to the conflict mentioned, there was an antidote of the framework of the 'threefold learning,' namely those of precept, meditation and wisdom (*jie ding*

---

[102] Robert Thurman (1978), "Buddhist Hermeneutics", in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 46.1 (March 1978), pp. 28-34.

[103] For its philosophy, see the introduction in D.T. Suzuki's English translation of the full text. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki (1973), *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra: A Mahayana Text* (translated for the first time from the original Sanskrit), London: Routledge & K. Paul.

hui sanxue 戒定慧三學) to include all the Buddhist praxis in one basket. When the tension between meditation and wisdom worsened, a reemphasising of the *vinayas* seemed to provide a means to secure the balance between them. Attempts to maintain the harmony of the 'threefold teaching' can be seen in the expressions "maintaining precepts to settle meditation" used by Tang literati or "Vinaya-supporting Zen" used by Eisai.

The competition within the 'threefold learning' is meanwhile intertwined with the argument for Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is noteworthy that the differentiation between Mahāyāna and Hinayana teachings seems to be the most crucial concern in the conceptual battles about the precepts. Yanagida Seizan noticed that the transformation of teachings on Mahāyāna meditation (大乘禪) can be regarded as a correspondence to the movement to promote Mahāyāna precepts (大乘戒運動). Yanagida's holistic view provides clues as to the elusive connection between the emergence of the Chan ideal and the wider context of the revitalisation of precepts movement. With Huisi's integration of Buddhist ideas, the anti-scholasticism went further to a different level of the conflict between meditation and wisdom. Huisi's views of Mahāyāna precepts, bodhisattvas' roles and the new form and significance of meditation, as mentioned in the previous section, corresponded to the larger context of the movement of Mahāyāna precepts and meditation in China. He played an important role in sixth century Buddhism in distinguishing Mahāyāna from Hinayana and for the separation between scholasticism and practice.

In this respect, however, Bodhidharma and Huisi were equally important in providing the legitimacy for early Chan Buddhism. The images of them conveyed in their biographies have some similarities: both of them emphasised meditation, encountering heavy criticism, which involved fierce suppression. Their experiences of suppression then led to the reinterpretation of meditation against exegetical studies.[104] A comparison of their writings shows that both figures advocated the importance of practice, which implies a separation between practice and scholasticism. In Bodhidharma's "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices," it clarifies that Buddhist teachings are secondary to the true principle of Buddhism and sitting meditation is the best method for attaining enlightenment.[105] Bodhidharma proposes methods for meditation for the sake of maintaining a balance in the attainment of both wisdom and meditation. Similarly, if we recollect Huisi's statement about sudden enlightenment and meditation for 'higher-capacity bodhisattvas,' it seems that both of them argued against the scholastic trend in China, especially towards the monasteries in the capital cities. For this reason, it is likely that the Chan writings were composed as arguments against existent views in society, instead of being those of a self-conscious school writing for its own right. When meditation is emphasised along with *prajñā*, the role of "mind" becomes more prominent. This "mind," in the context of intense discussions on Mahāyāna precepts and meditation, refers to that of a bodhisattva. The consensus regarding the "mind" lies in their views of *bodhicitta*, the

[104] Therefore, it does not strike us that in reality Huisi and Bodhidharma provided the same legitimacy for earlier authors which was later incorporated freely in the Chan writings, as will be discussed in Chapters Four and Five.

[105](然則入道多途, 要唯二種, 謂理行也, 藉教悟宗…令捨偽歸真, 疑住壁觀, 無自無他凡聖等一。) T 50: 551c8-10.

bodhisattva path, sudden enlightenment, *tathāgathagarbha*, meditation incorporated with *prajñā*. These are all in accordance with the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. The rise of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* was driven by the need for theories for practice and also a tendency to an inward-looking religious attitude.[106]

5. The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the notion of practice

The main theme dominating the Chinese attitude towards the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* lies in the dynamics of the separation and unification of meditation and scholasticism. The separation of meditation and scholasticism, compactly referred to by modern writers as *chanjiaofenli* (禪教分離) began to be prominent from the time of Huisi and Bodhidharma when the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* became more important. Chinese Buddhists of this period relied on the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* to develop their discussion about mind purification, but this foundational role did not prevent its fate of a decline in importance. On the other hand, it is intriguing that while the attitude toward the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* changes, Bodhidharma remains attractive for his symbolic value. The latter was traditionally regarded as introducing the former to China and for this reason the contradictory attitude needs resolution. Feeling compelled to disengage the connection between the two, Chinese monks were also puzzled as to how Bodhidharma could promote teachings which supported sudden enlightenment,

---

[106] This sort of religious attitude became dominant in medieval China and is relevant to the emphasis of "mind transmission" in Chan Buddhism. See T. H. Barrett (1990), "Kill the Patriarchs!", in *The Buddhist Forum*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, pp. 87-97.

which was not yet put forward as such in the sūtra. A passage in the *Zutangji* 祖堂集 illustrates the attempt to solve this problem.[107] Monk Daocun 道存 asks Master Yangshan 仰山 (840?-916?) whether it is true that the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* was introduced by Bodhidharma to China? Master Yangshan answers that it is an untruthful story. Beginning by a historian-like refutation about the dates of the translations, he then clarifies various concepts: the Buddha nature, sudden enlightenment, the provisional role of language (in the forms of preaching, texts and exegetical studies), and the importance of real practice (referring in this context to meditation practice). He then concludes that Bodhidharma's teaching of the *Laṅkāvatāra* was done simply out of a utilitarian consideration, like skilful means, because contemporary Buddhists were obsessed with exegetical studies and doctrinal debates, and also because an emphasis on real practice (修行) is the core both of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and in what Bodhidharma genuinely wanted to teach, especially in his "Treatise on the Two Entries and Four Practices."[108] Although the authority of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* later ebbed, one can see in the

---

[107] Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Sodōshū Sakuin* 祖堂集索引, Kyōto : Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo, 1980-1984, fascicle 18, p. 1619. For its value and compilation background, see Yanagida (2001), "Passion for Zen: Two Talks at the San Francisco Zen Center", translated and introduced by Urs App, in *The Eastern Buddhist* XXXIII, 2 (2001), pp. 68; 80-9.

[108] Cf. *Sodōshū* 祖堂集: "Seeking the similarities in these texts, we find that they give explanations and attractive presentations for beginners and emphasize practice as the main point." (緣經上有相似處，通說通誘童蒙，宗通修行者). Yanagida, *Sōdōshū Sakuin*, column 5.75, p. 1619.

emphasis on practice the major quality which later Buddhists continued to see in it, just as they saw it in the figure of Bodhidharma.

The concept of real practice was so prevalent that Daoxuan also expressed the same underlying logic. Daoxuan's message as a whole is complex, and integrated with the wider context regarding the end of Dharma. Most important of all, his insistence on the absolute purity of mind seems to be the bottom line of all of his writings on precepts and meditation, which for him constitute the major aspects of "practice". He put emphasis on the techniques of purification of mind in his "Method for mind purification, admonishment and contemplation" (*Jingxin jieguan fa* 淨心誡觀法, T45, no. 1893), which states that, for Buddhist practitioners, the outcome of a successful 'threefold learning' should be a purified mind. The underlying purpose of this approach is the formation of an idealised clergy, which is called the "*Laṅkāvatāra assembly*." (*Lengqie zhong* 楞伽眾).(T45: 819c)

This vouches for the prevailing perception among Tang literati: the definition of *Chan* as real practice, which is a dimension of Buddhism to be promoted in contrast with commentarial or exegetical tradition. In Bai Juyi's 白居易 (722-846) epitaph for Master Xingshan Weikuan 興善惟寬 (775-817)[109], to whom he paid four visits for intellectual exchanges, we find a definition of Chan Buddhism as follows:

---

[109] *QTW* 678. For information on Weikuan, see Mario Poceski (2007), *Ordinary Mind as the Way*, pp. 64-66.

> [Bai asked:] "Since you are called a Chan master, why do you still preach the *Dharma*?" The master answered: "In terms of the unsurpassed *bodhi*, that which applies to the body manifests the Buddhist rules (*lü*), that which is spelled out by the mouth manifests the *Dharma*, and that which is practised in mind manifests *Chan*. Even though there are three applications above, in reality they are one. It is just like the rivers and lakes which are named after their different locations: the names may vary, yet their nature of being water is all the same. (既曰禪師，何故說法？"師曰："無上菩提者，被於身為律，說於口為法，行於心為禪。應用有三，其實一也。如江湖河漢，在處立名，名雖不一，水性無二。*QTW* 628)

In this epitaph, the main attribute of Chan Buddhism is said to be the practice of mind, while that of the Buddhist law or rules (*lü*) is practice in the sense of living in accordance with the Vinaya. Both *Chan* and *Lü* are applications and manifestations of the enlightened, and hence in the meantime they are inseparable for the practitioner.[110] The aspect of practice is emphasised to such an extent that even preaching the Dharma is considered to be one form of practice. It is noticeable that when the activity of preaching the Dharma began to be recognised by the Chan masters, it indicates a change in their attitude to the act of "preaching" (*jiao* 教) which requires a certain degree of scholasticism. This implies an adjustment in the evaluation of scholasticism, so a new balance was required which was eventually articulated by Zongmi (780-841) as will be explained below. Under these changed circumstances, the function that the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* fulfilled for the anti-scholasticism movement came to an end. What follows is a tendency towards simplification which accounts for the rise of

[110] The coalition of Chan and Lü is also significant with respect to lineage, which will be explained further below.

the *Platform Sūtra* and the *Diamond Sūtra* which replace the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.[111] This tendency in Buddhist doctrine proved popular to Chinese minds in general as well as to the imperial family.

During the time when Bodhidharma travelled to Southern China in the sixth century, the dominant form of monastic education in Chinese monasteries continued to be based around scholasticism and exegetical studies.[112] Bodhidharma's attempt to counterbalance scholasticism reflects a tension between proponents and opponents of exegetical studies. This is echoed by Huisi who advocated meditation because of its value as actual practice. Until the separation of meditation and preaching was overcome again by Zongmi, who advocated the unification of meditation and preaching (*jiaochan yizhi* 教禪一致), this fundamental dichotomy between practice and scholasticism had prevailed for two centuries. Hence it is argued here that Zongmi's view, even though immensely influential for Song Buddhists a few centuries later, was actually a diversion from the original path at the time, and culturally concealed those other voices which attempted to separate meditation and scholasticism.

---

[111] The tendency to dismiss over-complicated doctrines continued down to the Song Dynasty. According to two prefaces by Jiang Zhiqi 蔣之奇（1031-1104）and Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037－1101), the *Laṅkāvatāra*is said to go against the trend of simplification, which led to the diminution of its influence. (T16: 479a-c).

[112] James Robson (2010), "Monastic Spaces and Sacred Traces: Facets of Chinese Buddhist Monastic Records", in J. A. Benn, L. Meeks and J. Robson, eds., *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, NY: Routledge, pp. 1-17, especially p. 44.

Zongmi expounded the lineage of *Chanzong* under the section of 'Gate to Practice and Attainment' (*Xiuzheng men* 修證門) in his "Sub-commentary to the Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment' (*Yuanjuejing dashu shiyi chao* 圓覺經大疏釋義鈔). (X9: 531a-532c) It is not difficult to fathom his integral view of the coalition between Chan and Vinaya, because both of them are linked to daily practice for Buddhist monks. He went further, however, to claim that the Chan School had the same origin as the Vinaya tradition before the separation between Vinaya and Chan transmission in India at a fairly early stage, or in his words "the separate practice of the Vinaya and the teachings " (*lüjiao biexing* 律教別行).[113] He states that at first Mahākasyapa taught Chan and Vinaya teachings together, but during the time of the fifth Indian patriarch Tiduojia 提多迦 (Skt. Dhṛtaka) some monks began to advocate an independent Vinaya branch. Taking Zongmi's personal circumstances into consideration, it becomes clear that his integration of the "threefold learning" reflects the conflict between meditation and wisdom (*dinghui zhi zheng* 定慧之爭) or, from the sixth century, the conflict between exegetics and practice. According to the epitaph written by Pei Xiu 裴休 (791-864), the most important disciple and a famous literatus, Zongmi was under attack

[113] It can be found in his "Preface to the Collected Writings on the Source of Chan" (*Chan yuan zhuquanji duxu* 禪源諸詮集都序), completed in 833. (T 48: 400b14.)

for engaging in scholarly activities and being “a slave to his own erudition.”[114] The emphasis on practice by bringing Chan and Vinaya together was Zongmi’s strategy, and soon he established his stance and published his criticism of the anti-scholasticism of the Hongzhou branch, which was radically antinomian and in his opinion dangerous. Despite the discrepancies in the discourse, it is evident that Zongmi and other Chan branches of his time were all looking for antidotes to the disputes between scholarly tradition and meditational practice.

6. Chan Transmission and the Vinaya Tradition

Zongmi's claim that the Chan School had the same origin as the Vinaya tradition reflects the interdependence of Chan and Vinaya in issues concerning ordinations and transmission. As the most influential Vinaya master of his time, Daoxuan’s 道宣 (596-667) vision of *Jetavana* initiated an “ordination platform movement,” which ended up with a flurry of activities to establish ordination platforms all over China continuing to the mid-ninth century.[115] A number of Chan figures, including Shenhui and others, were actively involved in the activities of establishing ordination platforms. In Daoxuan’s eyes, the ordination ceremony and the physical ordination platform represented the wellspring of mysterious supernatural power which derives from Śākyamuni. (McRae, 2005: 71)

---

[114] T 50, 742b. Cited in John Kieschnick (1997), *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*, Honolulu (USA): University of Hawai'i Press, 1997, p. 131.

[115] See McRae (2005: 68-100) for a detailed survey of the platform establishment movement. McRae concludes that Daoxuan’s motivation and goal was to re-legitimate the Buddhist Order.

The vision of *Jetavana* enabled an intense feeling of a direct connection with the Buddha during the absence of the Buddha in person.

After Daoxuan's death, Hongjing 弘景 (634-712), Jianzhen 鑑真 (688 - 763), Yixing 一行 (683-727), and Yinzong 印宗 (627 -713) were active in establishing ordination platforms. Among them, Yinzong performed the ordination for Huineng 慧能 (638-713). He became interested in and committed to precept supervision when he studied with Huineng and Hongren 弘忍 (601- 674).(T50: 731b) Later on, Xuanyan 玄儼 (675 -742) and his disciple Dayi 大義 (691- 779) were active in transmitting both Chan and precepts in the region of present day Zhejiang and Jiangsu provinces, from where Jianzhen came.[116] These are examples which show that Chan masters involved themselves equally in meditation and ordination platform establishment.

It was in fact very common in the surrounding environment for Chan and Vinaya to be mixed.[117] During the fifth century, in Gansu and Shanxi regions, there were Buddhist masters such as Xuangao 玄高 (d. 444) and Zhicheng 智稱 (430-501), who were known for their combination of Vinaya and meditation

---

[116] The abovementioned monks and events are listed in McRae (2005: 85-88).

[117] Saitō Tomohiro 斎藤智寛(2008), "Satorenakatta hitobito—Zen Ritsu sōshūsha no inori to sukui"悟れなかった人人—禅律双修者の祈りと救い, in *Tōhō Gakuhō* 東方学報 82, pp. 69-117. A list of monks who practised both can also be found in the "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks."

practice. (T 50: 401b, 402b-c)[118] In Sichuan province, Xuanchang 玄暢 was active in teaching *Shisong lü* 十誦律, meditation, Huayan and the Bodhisattva Precepts. (T 50: 377a-c) In the biography of Baizhang Huihai 百丈懷海 (749 - 814), it is written that since Bodhidharma, meditation monks usually resided in *Vinaya* monasteries.[119]

As Yanagida noticed, the legacy of the transmission of Chan and Vinaya groups was in reality intertwined.[120] In fact, with respect to the acquisition of authority during the absence of Buddha, the *Vinaya* had of course the function of providing a continuous succession and transmission through the ordination ceremony even before the emergence of Chan Buddhism. Nevertheless, to most people, Chan's discourse on Buddhist transmission is much better known because the ideas linking the importance of precepts to the decline of Dharma were taken up by Chan Buddhism and formed a creative narrative. An unbroken transmission from the Buddha became the essential part of Chan Buddhism in providing the required authority. (Barrett, 1990: 87-97) The evidence, however, shows that the

---

[118] Xuangao was described as mastering the key teachings of Chan and Lü (盡禪門，深解律要). A brief mention of this is found in Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄 (1986), *Chūgoku bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū* 中国仏教における戒律の研究**.** Tōkyō : Mokujisha, p. 30.

[119] T50, 770c-771a. Saitō Tomohiro (2008) noticed the regional difference, such as Buddhism in Chengdu.

[120] (禪律互傳) Yanagida (1967: 60).

main part of the Chan lineage narrative was drawn from the Vinaya tradition.[121] Regardless of the restless debates on the selection of Chan patriarchs, the argument in the "Biographies of the Precious Forest" (*Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳, 801 A.D.) that Bodhidharma was to be the twenty-eighth patriarch became widely accepted. This is the earliest text within the Chan tradition to borrow the lineage account in the "Record of the Masters of the Sarvāstivāda School" (*Sapoduo shizi zhuan* 薩婆多師資傳, c. 500 AD) by Sengyou 僧祐 (445-518) of the Liang Dynasty. Although the full text is now lost, its preface was fortunately collected in Sengyou's "Collection of Notes Concerning the Translation of the Tripitaka" (*Chu sangzang jiji* 出三藏記集, T55: 88c-90b), and the original text is quoted in a number of other texts.[122] It is regarded as one of the major textual sources for the

---

[121] In comparing the patriarchs listed in Chan texts, Bangwei Wang draws our attention to the Indian origin of the patriarchal tradition. Under the Indian background, when the Saṃgha split into different nikāyas, the genealogy was needed to prove the legitimacy of some Buddhist leaders. The Chinese "Account of the Transmission of the Dharmapitaka" can be regarded as a result of this Indian trend. Bangwei Wang 王邦惟 (1997), "The Indian Origin of the Chinese Buddhist Chan School's Patriarch Tradition," in *Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thích Huyền-Vi,* à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire, dirigé par Bhikkhu Tampalawela Dhammaratana Chikkhu Pāsādika, Éditions You-Feng, Libraire Éditeur, Paris, pp. 260-270.

[122] For a detailed textual study, see Funayama, Tōru 船山徹 (2000), '*Tang Buddhism and the* Sapoduo shizi zhuan (Record of the Masters of the Sarvāstivāda School) *Compiled by Sengyou of the Liang Dynasty*' 梁の僧祐撰《薩婆多師資傳》と唐代佛教, in *Tōdai no shūkyō* 唐代の宗教, ed. by Yoshikawa Tadao 吉川忠夫, Research Report of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, Kyoto: Hōyū shoten, pp. 325 – 54.

Nanshan Vinaya School (*Nanshan lüzong* 南山律宗) in China, which is represented by its leader Daoxuan.

Funayama (2000: 338-42) points out that the underlying purpose of these texts is related in sophisticated ways to the doctrinal and political affiliations of the authors themselves. He recognises that there may be at least a structural similarity between Sengyou's account and the "Account of the Transmission of the Dharmapitaka" (*Fufazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因緣傳, ca. 6th century) and the "Biographies of the Precious Forest," but he then argues that the possibility of a direct influence of the former on the latter two is rather indefinite. It is difficult to ascertain a direct relationship between them, because whether the "Record of the Masters of the Sarvāstivāda School" was available or not during the Tang Dynasty is an unsettled question. On the other hand, this text's influence on Daoxuan is rather obvious. While Funayama's conclusion is valid in itself, it could in fact be argued, more decisively, that the same lineage narrative found in the "Record of the Masters of the Sarvāstivāda School" and the "Biographies of the Precious Forest" may have been passed via the medium of other Vinaya texts, such that a direct borrowing was not necessary. There was an intimate relationship between Chan and Vinaya masters, who often dwelled in the same monasteries. (Saitō 2008) It is not surprising that they shared the same repertoire in these circumstances. Hence, the exploration of the similarities between Chan and Vinaya texts offers a glimpse of the interaction between Chan and Vinaya groups. They were united doctrinally by the framework of 'threefold learning,' practically by the practitioners who sought to compete with the exegetical tradition, and

historically through their collaboration in establishing ordination platforms and lineages.

7. The notion of lineage

Continuing from the very real concern about the transmission of the Dharma during the absence of the Buddha, lineage invention began in the Sanlun and Tiantai groups due to issues of legitimacy and succession.[123] Jizang 吉藏 (549-623), Guanding 灌頂 (561-632), and Zhanran 湛然 (711-82) were all finding solutions for the question: Should the legitimate succession be through texts or masters? The preference for the practice of meditation over against exegetical studies, which was proposed during Huisi's time, supports the argument against the necessity of textual resources. However, as a counterbalance to the rejection of sūtras and literature, there was also a voice advocating textual transmission in the texts of the early eighth century. In both Chan and Tiantai lineages, the patriarchs represent the legitimacy descended directly from the Buddha. In this way the temporal discontinuation could be swiftly solved because as long as one finds a link with any of patriarchs in the line, one can link to the Buddha immediately. On the other hand, the figures in the past seem to have a mainly symbolic force, for there are all kinds of imaginative means which are employed to create a link with the lineage.[124] I further argue therefore that the

[123] Elizabeth Morrison (2010), *The Power of Patriarchs: Qisong and Lineages in Chinese Buddhism*, Leiden: Brill. Introduction, pp. 45-6.

[124] The fluidity of the concept of lineage provides opportunities for the *east-flow* of Chan Buddhism, which will be treated in a separate chapter.

movement of the separation of teaching and meditation had led to a shift in the attitude towards scriptures and patriarchs, which in turn stirred up the initial call for the Chan ideal. Thus the notion of lineage is also linked with meditators arguing against scholasticism because of their worries over the decline of the Dharma.

As Elizabeth Morrison argues, the notion of lineage, especially that which has been identified with the Chan tradition, arose in fits and starts in different Buddhist groups as a justification for the transmission of textual knowledge. (Morrison, 2010: 7) The notion of lineage is not exclusive to Chan; rather, as we have emphasised, the construction of lineage was a response to a widespread belief in the decline of Dharma. It points to the need to identify reliable sources of authority, whether through masters or texts. These concerns predate Chan Buddhism. (Morrison, 2010: 14) In general, the teacher-disciple relationship has maintained the continuity of Buddhist transmission more efficiently than was the case with Confucian learning.[125] On the other hand, the emphasis on masters was not consistently significant all the time, as the lineage accounts convey. The necessity of masters fluctuates in accordance with the debates associated with the balance between textual learning and meditational practice, which all fit into the needs arising out of social circumstances.[126]

When the fear of decline of Buddhism arose due to persecutions and internal warfare, there were doubts over competing textual interpretations and a

[125] David L. McMullen (1988), *State and Scholars in T'ang China*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp. 48-9.

[126] It moved in an analogous direction with the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, which enabled self-ordination for Chinese Buddhists, as the next chapter explains.

search for reliable authority. As responses were demanded, the doors to new interpretive opportunities opened. Lineage construction was one of the reactions. Barrett (1990) connects the decline of the Dharma with lineage specifically in relation to Chan Buddhism. In the transmission of the *Damoduolo chanjing* 達摩多羅禪經, he finds that the line of bodhisattvas simply guarantees the texts so there is no further need of some kind of "superman" to pass it on. The subsequent rejection of texts is likely to have been due to an awareness of "the fallibility of texts – and, yet more so, of their readers." (Barrett 1990: 94) This reasoning can be found in the case of the great Chinese translator Xuanzang 玄奘 (600-664) who was assailed by worries over the decline of the Dharma even in his moments of greatest triumph.[127] The solution to such worries seems to be an unbroken lineage descending from the Buddha. As Barrett writes:

> The best alternative, then, was to assert boldly that the lamp of the dharma still blazed on, as it had in the uncomprehending dark even before Hsuan-tsang had felt moved to go to India. For it blazed on not among the exegetes who thronged the famous monasteries of the capital but far away in the mountainous retreats of a line of meditators, a hitherto neglected "string of pearls" who had already received this transmission of the lamp from India two centuries earlier...at a time now so distant that any assertions concerning Bodhidharma, key link in the chain, were, of course, no longer subject to disproof. (Barrett, 1990: 97)

The explanation that the problem could best be solved with reference to an obscure figure coming from a distant past is very convincing. The intention to

[127] (Barrett 1990: 95). Also see Xuanzang's statement in T50: 261a.

compete with the exegetes in the capital is evidenced, a trend already demonstrated by the case of Huisi. Not surprisingly, the earliest lineages would have come out from the hands of those who were most concerned about textual transmission. I would, however, add that the image of Bodhidharma was appealing not only because of its role against the exegetes, but also because of the potency of meditation bolstered by the notion of "practice" as a whole. In a later part of this chapter, it will become clear that the patriarchs were regarded as the precious pearls, and the string could be both meditational practice and the *Vinaya*, which also needed to be "practised".

8. Textual transmission

The role that Daoxuan's writing played, however, brought attention to the exemplar Bodhidharma, as well as to disputations about the textual sources associated with Bodhidharma, which in turn stimulated the birth of Chan Buddhism. The first known claim of descent from Bodhidharma is the epitaph for Faru 法如 (638-689), a long-time disciple of Hongren 弘忍 (601-674).[128] The anonymous author of the epitaph writes of an "Indian transmission that occurs without recourse to language."[129] It is an explicit expression of a silent, wordless transmission from an Indian origin. This is the first time that the legacy of Bodhidharma was proclaimed as being the transmission of the mysterious object of silent understanding, which is more than just exegetical mastery. (Morrison,

[128] For a full annotation of the epitaph (*Tang Zhongyue shamen Shi Faru xingzhuang* 唐中岳沙門釋法如行狀) see Yanagida (1967: 487-496).

[129] (天竺相承, 本無文字) Translated as in Morrison (2010:53).

2010: 54) The theme of a transmission against the exegetical tradition was taken up by Jingjue 淨覺 (683-c.750), the author of "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters" (*Lengqie shiziji* 楞伽師資記. 712-716 A.D.), though his purpose was largely to protect himself against attacks from Shenhui's group.[130] Adapting from Daoxuan's biographies, he added to the authority of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, displaying his devotion to it but at the same time articulating an inconsistent attitude towards texts and language for the purpose of transmission. (Morrison 2010: 57) Faure has suggested that this attitude can be understood as an example of the magical potency attributed to texts, while Welter avers that it "allows Chan practitioners to transcend textual limitations."[131] The reality is that Jingjue's reserved attitude is not an entire rejection of text as such, but an integration of patriarchal legitimacy and textual authority while casting off the necessity of exegetical tradition. Jingjue contributed to the evolution of symbolic lineage in that, as Morrison (2010: 59) noticed, the first two patriarchs, Bodhidharma and Guṇabhadra, never once met. The biography of Daoxin in Jingjue's work is

[130] For Jingjue's biography, see *QTW* 327, "*Da Tang Da'anguosi gudade Jingjue shi taming* " 大唐大安國寺故大德淨覺師塔銘, written by the famous Tang poet Wang Wei 王維 (701-761). An alternative rendering for the title of this text is "Record of the Masters and Disciples of the *Laṅkāvatāra*" for which see Bernard Faure (1997), *The Will to Orthodoxy: a critical genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism,* California : Stanford University Press. On the date of the composition and the political circumstances of Jingjue, see T. H. Barrett (1991), "The Date of the Leng-chia shih-tzu chih", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1.2 (1991), pp. 255-9.

[131] Faure (1997: 137; 140-1). Albert Welter (2006), *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 48.

valuable for he brings out the attempt to introduce the techniques of meditation through Daoxin, who is recorded as transmitting a manual on the conferral of Bodhisattva precepts. His approach to meditation, or even to a wider concept of practice, is called the "One practice samādhi" (一行三昧), which continued to be the core of the Chan teachings passing to Japan, though it was discontinued in Shenhui and Zongmi's writings.[132]

Shenhui's attack on the "Northern School", mainly through negating the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, had a long-lasting effect on the narratives concerning the history of Chan Buddhism. Unable to refute the crucial patriarch Bodhidharma, he replaced the textual authority of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* with the *Diamond Sūtra*. Among all the accounts relating to the biography of Bodhidharma, only those influenced by Shenhui have omitted the transmission of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra.*[133] The attitude towards the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, then, becomes an indicator of the underlying agenda, which reveals a polemical stance rather than a doctrinal differentiation. The attempt to remove the reliance on exegetical tradition is universal in Chan Buddhism, and, as a consequence, the texts functioned more as a protector of the religious identity of the community. Likewise, other texts associated with Bodhidharma could become the target for attack from anyone who intended to create a different lineage. For instance, Du Fei's 杜朏 "Record of the Transmission of the Jewel of Dharma" (*Chuan fabao ji* 傳法寶記) criticises the

---

[132] For a study of this doctrine as it occurred in the biography of Daoxin, see Sekiguchi (1957: 279-292).

[133] For a chart of all relevant accounts, see Sekiguchi (1957: 176).

biography of Bodhidharma in the "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" as a false tale, arguing against the authenticity of "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices" or the "Bodhidharma's Treatise" (*Daomo lun* 達摩論) mentioned in the "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters."[134] The "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" was written around the same time as the apocryphal *Vajrasamādhi Sūtra*, and the latter, just as the "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters," regards the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices" as the highest authority in Chinese Buddhism. (Buswell 1989: 110) It shows that the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices," which was fictively attributed to Bodhidharma, was very influential during the earlier periods, but the evaluation was already changing during the seeming peak time of its influence; this is very similar to the fate which befell the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, which was already waning at the summit of its visibility. As mentioned earlier, the value of both scriptures was recognised by contemporaries for their guidance on the *practice* of mind and meditation. Their function in counterbalancing the competition between wisdom and meditation had played a successful role.

The "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters" and the "Record of the Transmission of the Jewel of Dharma" were composed during almost the same period. The latter criticises the former as well as Daoxuan's biographies, all with a view to refuting texts possibly written by Bodhidharma himself. These arguments brought up the element of the "formless transmission" of Chan Buddhism.

[134] T85: 1291b7-10. (今人間或有文字稱達摩論者。蓋是當時學人隨自得語以為真論書而寶之。亦多謬也。若夫超悟相承者。既得之於心則無所容聲矣。) For a chart of the different statements about the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices," see Sekiguchi (1957:216).

Yanagida states that the famous phrase "transmission from mind to mind; no reliance on words" (*yixin chuanxin, buli wenzi* 以心傳心，不立文字), which became a dominant designation of the Chan School, was actually created by Du Fei in the "Record of the Transmission of the Jewel of Dharma." This work adheres to the teachings of non-language transmission found in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. The path leading to the characterisation of Chan Buddhism as formless originated from suspicion about the biographies of Bodhidharma and disputation about the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices." It seems that the solution summed up as formless transmission and formless practice was a reaction against the exegetically based faith in Bodhidharma and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.[135] Entering the seventh century, anti-scholasticism required adjustment, but the Chan ideal continued to develop.

It should be noted, however, that the disagreements discussed above lie in the textual relations associated with Bodhidharma, and are not so much about the patriarchal image itself. After Du Fei, the dispute about this image continued for centuries.[136] There are different versions of the genealogy of Chan patriarchs in various texts, for example, and arguments concerning the number of patriarchs

---

[135] This already presaged the reworking or redefinition of an appropriate ordination platform, which will be treated in the next section.

[136] Notable narratives of the Chan lineage in Tang sources include: a) *Putidamo Nanzong ding shifei lun* 菩提達摩南宗定是非論 by Shenhui (732 AD); b) *Lidai fabaoji* 歷代法寶記 (c. 775AD); c) *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 (801 AD); d) "*Gu Zuoxi dashi bei*" 故左溪大師碑 by Li Hua 李華 (d. 766?); e) The epitaph for Ruhai 如海 (727-809) by Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773-819); f) Bai Juyi's "*Xijing Xingshansi chuan fatang beiming*"西京興善寺傳法堂碑銘 for Xingshan (775-817).

and the position of Bodhidharma in the sequence. In these arguments the selection of patriarchs and their sequence serve a function other than the legitimation of authentic experience: they legitimise the cultural-religious identity of the authors. For example, the inconsistency among the lineage accounts indicates a switch between exclusivity and inclusivity. In contrast with Shenhui and Zhanran's exclusion of some masters, thus fortifying a single transmission, the literati demonstrate openness towards multiple branches within a lineage, even though hierarchy is still emphasised. Morrison (2010: 66-7) describes this as the application of the notion of a large and glorious clan to Buddhist lineage questions by lay Buddhists. Just as earlier lineage accounts adopt a multiple origin model up until Shenhui's argument for a single transmission, we later see here – with the literati –a shift from an exclusive stance to an inclusive one.

Concluding remarks

This chapter discusses several aspects of the belief in the "decline of Buddhism" and shows how they issued in the creation of Chan Buddhism. The first one is about the notion of "real practice," adduced to bolster the argument against the exegetic tradition. From Huisi's time, the separation between meditation and teaching became consolidated. Huisi's advocacy of *mofa* belief, in his *Vows*, is the foundation of the new approach to practice proposed by him, formless meditation. This strand of thought corresponded with the underlying logic of the promotion of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* by Bodhidharma's disciples and Jingjue.

Second, when doubts about exegetical tradition and scholasticism first increased within the Tiantai circle, an alternative method of transmitting authority became a central concern of Chinese Buddhists in general. Lineages of patriarchs were advanced to suggest a reliable textual transmission, while at the same time the best lineage was supposed to be that of meditation monks. As in Faru's epitaph and the "Chronicle of Materials of the *Laṅkā* Masters," the figure of Bodhidharma was brought into the lineage perspective to provide a model of wordless mind transmission. To avoid contemporary criticisms, the concept of a symbolic lineage without real masters was conceived for legitimising the transmission. It was such a success that after that the lineage was no longer questioned and all debates centred on the texts rather than on the figure of Bodhidharma.

The argument over the "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks," especially about the discrepancy between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices," demonstrates the existence of multiple voices about the textual transmission during the late seventh century. As the attention to lineages increased dramatically during the seventh to eighth centuries, Bodhidharma was brought in for the purpose of weakening the primacy of scriptures. The perpetual dichotomy between scholasticism and real practice was embedded in the patriarchal image within the Chan community, as shown in Facai's inscription, which seems to have been rooted in the historical circumstances.

Taking all this together we may confidently conclude that the concept of lineage is a consequence of the *mofa* anxiety. Fear of the decline of Buddhism led to the need to identify reliable sources of authority but also to the perplexities

about whether textual or master transmission could best endure the challenges of Buddhist persecutions and a decaying *saṃgha* in the capital cities. In the wake of the corruption of exegetic tradition, the alternative meditation masters and vinaya masters began to compose the patriarch image to fill in the line of lineages. The confluence of all these aspects led to the rise of Chan Buddhism. The following chapter testifies to the close relationships, in theory and in practice, between traditions of precepts and meditation.

Chapter Three

The Bodhisattva Precepts: the Origin of the *Platform Sūtra*

It is notable that Japanese bibliographies provide an important clue revealing a forgotten, and so later unnoticed, link between Bodhisattva precepts and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. The Bodhisattva precepts connected with the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* were the provenance of the ideology of the formless precepts which feature in the *Platform Sūtra*. At the same time, as explained in the previous chapter, the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* functioned as supporting material for the anti-scholastic trend in which meditational practice and mind-to-mind Chan lineages were advocated. From an examination of the process of the composition of the *Platform Sūtra*, we can see that its fundamental ideas evolved from reworking existent interpretations of the Bodhisattva precepts. Since these processes were interrelated, the present chapter is to be read in close conjunction with the previous one.

The discussion will begin with an analysis of the doctrinal link between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* during a period when the bodhisattva ideal was being conceptualised and formulated. The Chinese concept of the bodhisattva ideal was much affected by despair about the decline of the Dharma. As the previous chapter illustrates, Chinese monks' worry over the decline of Buddhism was an underlying theme in their writing and was not exclusive to Chan Buddhism. It certainly provides a background, as far as

doctrinal tendencies are concerned, to understand the popularity of these two scriptures. It will also further the discussion to put the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* into its social and political context. While the fifth and sixth centuries saw the emergence of a new relationship between the Buddhist community and the state, the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* reflected tensions within the context of Chinese Buddhism. When the establishment and re-emphasis of Bodhisattva precepts began in the sixth century in China, increasing numbers of laypeople and simplified Buddhist rules brought about friction over issues concerning monasticism.[137] It was a crucial task for Chinese monks, although it may not appear so obvious to us, to work out a suitable ordination ceremony. This was the main purpose of Shenxiu and Shenhui's works and of the *Platform Sūtra*. In brief, this chapter will discuss the emergence of the *Platform Sūtra* with respect to the following aspects: 1) the emphasis on mind and formless precepts in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*; 2) the relationship between meditation and repentance in the ordination ceremony; 3) the concept of the bodhisattva ideal in the context of *mofa* (decline of the Dharma); 4) the idea of a Buddhist's relationship with the absent Buddha; 5) the reformation of monasticism over against the decline of the Order; 6) cultural identity brought out through the adaptation of *vinayas*; 7) the reworking of ordinations and the emergence of the *Platform Sūtra.*

[137] For a detailed historical survey see Funayama Tōru 船山徹(1995), 'Rokuchō jidai niokeru bosatsukai no juyō katei: Rūsō, Nanseiki wo chūshin ni' 六朝時代における菩薩戒の受容過程—劉宋．南齊期を中心に, *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 67 (1995), pp. 1 – 135. Also Andreas Janousch (1999), "The Emperor as Bodhisattva: the Bodhisattva Ordination and Ritual Assemblies of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty", in *State and Court Ritual in China*, ed., Joseph P. McDermott, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

1. The Doctrinal Context of Bodhisattva Precepts: An Inward-looking Tendency

Before entering the discussion below, it will be instructive to distinguish the texts of Bodhisattva precepts from manuals of precept conferral**.** Following the distinction made by Tadeusz Skorupski, there are two types of ritual texts for taking the vow of bodhisattva morality: a) those with an outline of the basic principles but no concrete rules; b) those with concrete rules.[138] The first type is represented by the Indian philosopher Candragomin (seventh century) and in the Chinese *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* (Ch. *Fanwang jing* 梵網經). (Skorupski, 2001: 17) As a different type of Buddhist literature, the concrete rules played an important role in providing the ordinations to a bodhisattva, which literally refers to every self-conscious Mahāyāna Buddhist.

According to Zhiyi's "Commentary on the Meaning of Bodhisattva Precepts" (*Pusa jieyi shu* 菩薩戒義疏, T40: 568a), there are two systems of Bodhisattva precepts: (1) that of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* associated with the "Sūtra on Original Acts that Serve as Necklaces for the Bodhisattvas" (*Pusa yingluobenye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業経, T.1485), which emphasizes the ten transgressions and the initiation of *bodhicitta*. (2) the system of the "Sūtra on the Spiritual States of the Bodhisattva" (*Pusa dichi jing* 菩薩地持經, Sk. *Bodhisattvabhūmi Sūtra*), which is affiliated to the "Treatise on the Stages of Yoga Practice" (*Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師第論, Sk. *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*), emphasizing the three clusters of pure

[138] Tadeusz Skorupski (2001), *The Buddhist Forum*, volume 6, Tring: Institute of Buddhist Studies, pp. 15-23.

precepts.[139] The concept of Bodhisattva precepts in China originated, therefore, from two strands during the fifth century, the first being the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* and the second being derived from the *Yogācāra* School, where meditation and gradual practice is highlighted. The *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, which proved hugely popular in southern China, relies on Vairocana Buddha as its sole authority and expounds the ten stages of achievement in meditation. (T24: 997c11-14) Both scriptures are concerned not only with moral conduct but also with the supposed consciousness of the bodhisattva. Moreover, both put much emphasis on the diligent practice of meditation. The majority of Chinese Buddhists, such as Zhiyi and Shenxiu, took the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* as the doctrinal basis of their Bodhisattva precepts.

The doctrinal evolution underwent a transformation from Shenxiu's "Gateway to the Mahāyāna Skilful Means for Non-Birth" (*Dasheng wusheng fangbianmen* 大乘無生方便門) into the Dunhuang manuscript of the *Platform Sūtra* 古壇經.[140] (Satō, 1986: 391-4) The strong doctrinal affiliation reflects Huisi's influence on other early Chan texts, such as "Bodhidharma's Dharma Gate" (*Damo famen* 達摩法門), Daoxin's "Manual of Rules of Bodhisattva Precepts" (*Daoxin Pusajie fa* 道信菩薩戒法), Jingjue's "Chronicle of the Sources of the *Laṅkā* Masters" (*Lengqie shiziji* 楞伽師資記), and Shenxiu's "Gateway to

---

[139] Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄 (1986), *Chūgoku bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū* 中国仏教における戒律の研究. Tōkyō : Mokujisha, pp. 347-60.

[140] The "*Dasheng wusheng fangbianmen*" is also called "*Dasheng wufangbian*" 大乘五方便 ("Five Skilful Means of Mahāyāna"). T 85, no. 2834, 1273a – 8b.

the Mahāyāna Skilful Means for Non-Birth."[141] Moreover, the Tantric monk Śubhākarasiṃha (Ch. Shan Wuwei 善無畏, 637 - 735) composed his "Elements of Meditation" (*Wuwei sanzang chanyao* 無畏三藏禪要) by making additions and revisions to Shenxiu's "Gateway to the Mahāyāna Skilful Means for Non-Birth." In this regard, the continuity from Huisi, Daoxin, Shenxiu and Śubhākarasiṃha provided doctrinal connections between Esoteric Buddhism, Tiantai and Chan Buddhism.

It appears that, in the procedure of the conferral of Bodhisattva precepts, meditation and precepts were two sides of the same coin. The procedure of precept conferral is rather informative for understanding the ninth century perception of Bodhisattva precepts. According to the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* in advance of the precept conferral ritual, repentance and meditation are two important requirements for receiving Bodhisattva precepts.[142] As one of the earliest examples, in the fifth century, Daojin 道進 (also known as Fajin 法進) once expressed his request to receive the Bodhisattva precepts from Dharmakṣema 曇無讖 (385-433).[143] In response, Dharmakṣema instructed him that deep repentance and diligent

---

[141] Paul Magnin (1979), *La vie et l'oeuvre de Huisi*, Paris: École Française D'Extrême-Orient, pp. 117-128

[142] Li-ying Kuo (1994), *Confession et contrition dans le bouddhisme chinois du Ve au Xe siècle*, Paris: EFEO, pp. 57-8.

[143] In the fifth century, Chinese Buddhists were interested in the concept of Buddha-nature. In order to resolve disagreements over the concept of Buddha-nature, Dharmakṣema was asked to translate one of the editions of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (Ch. *Niepan jing* 涅槃經, T12, no. 374) to reassure Chinese Buddhists that their understanding was orthodox (T50, no. 2059, 336c.)

meditation must be completed before receiving the Bodhisattva precepts, so as to remove all karmic obstructions.[144] In other words, for the transmission of Bodhisattva precepts, meditation is a compulsory preparatory step for the sake of the purification of mind. It means that the Bodhisattva precepts were never separated from meditational practice on the basis of the purification of mind. The affinities in praxis and doctrine confirm the interdependency between Chan and Bodhisattva precepts.

The concept of purified mind prevailed during the development of Chan Buddhism in China. Between the seventh and eighth centuries, the 'Northern Chan' tradition, which was transmitted through written scriptures and patriarchs, had roots which are strongly linked to Bodhisattva precepts, especially through Daoxin's teachings. According to Jingjue's "Chronicle of the Sources of the *Laṅkā* Masters" (*Lengqie shiziji* 楞伽師資記), Guṇabhadra 求那跋陀羅 (394 – 468), one of the translators of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, was the first patriarch of the *Laṅkā* tradition and Bodhidharma was the second. Guṇabhadra, in common with Bodhidharma, was regarded as having supernatural powers, the result of constant

[144] This story of Daojin and Dharmakṣema was the earliest record of the appearance of Bodhisattva precept conferral in China. See Funayama Tōru (1995: 6-20). Kuo (1994) has provided a detailed survey of classifications of Buddhist repentance in Daoxuan's system (p. 36), in Huisi's (pp. 75-8) and in Zhiyi's (pp. 61-2). The necessity of confession is expressed in a number of Mahāyāna texts, notably the *Sūtra of Golden Light*, see R. E. Emmerick (1970), *The Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarnabhāsottamasūtra*, London: Luzac, pp. 8-17. (Cf. T 663: 336b10-339a6.) Nobuyoshi Yamabe (2005:20) also demonstrates a link between repentance and visionary experience. The visionary experience was also important in connection with meditational experience and Buddha-name chanting practice. Here one sees how in practice Pure Land, Chan and Vinaya could be interwoven with each other.

meditation practice. According to Jingjue, both Indian masters taught meditation and precepts concurrently, promoting the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and bodhisattva precepts side by side. Meditation and precepts are paired because of their doctrinal implications for the purification of mind. According to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, a pure mind is validated by non-transgression of the precepts; it also states that, among the six perfections, the perfection of keeping the precepts must be realised through well-controlled consciousness and a deep understanding of emptiness. Again, according to this sūtra, the Bodhisattva precepts are built upon the elimination of illusions. It is clear that, Jingjue regards the *Laṅkāvatāra* tradition and the Bodhisattva precepts as having close doctrinal affinities. And yet, the emergence into prominence of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the Bodhisattva precepts are to be considered as part of a broader context in the early development of Mahāyāna Buddhism in China.

In keeping with the Chinese tradition of making doctrinal classifications, the Chinese master Zhiyi 智顗 (538–597) designed a sophisticated hierarchy which positions the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* as the last sermon by the Buddha. This was a response to the inconsistencies within Buddhist teachings and the disputation over the status of and relations between the "vehicles." During Zhiyi's time, Mahāyāna precepts provoked a great deal of dispute whereas the Hīnayāna Vinaya alone did not have many advocates.[145] The earliest Mahāyāna texts, quickly available in Chinese versions, already displayed a dialectical relationship with Hīnayāna schools such as the Sarvāstivāda. The bodhisattva path was almost

[145] For a collection of scriptures concerning Buddhist precepts and *Vinaya*, see Ōno Hōdō 大野法道 (1954), *Daijō kaikyō no kenkyū* 大乗戒経の研究, Tokyo: Risōsha, 1954.

universally accepted as the highest approach to enlightenment, and Chinese Buddhists accepted that, as they read in the *Lotus Sūtra* and the *Flower Garland Sūtra* (*Huayan jing* 華嚴經, Sk. *Avataṃsakasūtra*) the *śrāvakas* and the *pratyekabuddhas*, unlike the bodhisattvas, have insufficient faculties to understand the Buddha's teachings fully. At the same time, the Hīnayāna traditions had been brought along into the country with all the rest, so how was their status to be understood? In solving the conflicting ideas about various "vehicles," Zhiyi maintains that a Mahāyāna monk can observe Hīnayāna precepts with a Mahāyāna mind. The Hīnayāna Vinaya had been devised for the purpose of leading people to Buddhahood, and it would potentially reveal that final goal, so there was no conflict between the Vinaya and a Mahāyāna goal. The debate on Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna precepts thus led to a conceptual change: the Vinaya, in combining with bodhisattva vows, may be transformed into Mahāyāna precepts.[146] This explanation was called "*kaihui*" 開会 (disclosing and harmonizing).[147] In this vein, based on Zhiyi's highlighting of the bodhisattvas, Mingkuang 明曠 (late eighth century), in his "Commentary to the Tiantai Bodhisattva Precepts" (*Tiantai pusa jie shu* 天台菩薩戒疏), differentiated the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna precepts and

[146] See Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 (1997), "Chigi ni okeru shōmon to bosatsukai" 智顗における聲聞戒と菩薩戒 (The Meanings of Śrāvaka- Śīla and Bodhisattva-Śīla Interpreted by Chih-i), *in Tendai daishi kenkyū* 天台大師研究, Tokyo: Tendai gakkai, pp.1-26.

[147] Paul Groner (1984), *Saichō:The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, Seoul: Po Chin Chai. p. 199.

further advocated the Bodhisattva precepts as found in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. (T 40: 580c–584a)

The Mahāyāna adoption of the Hīnayāna precepts was an effective solution since it supported the Bodhisattva precepts at the same time. The incorporation of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna precepts is best illustrated in the classification system called the "three clusters of pure precepts" (Ch. *Sanju jingjie*, Jp. *Sanju jōkai* 三聚淨戒), which include: (1) the prevention of evil, (2) the promotion of good, and (3) the salvation of sentient beings.[148] Among the three clusters, the prevention of evil may be identified with Hīnayāna Vinaya and the promotion of good as Mahāyāna precepts. It shows that, again, purification of mind is the ultimate goal of observing the precepts. In Esoteric Buddhism, the idea of a purified mind as the goal similarly makes meditation and precept conferral inseparable in practice, as mentioned in the previous chapter. It is understandable therefore that "three clusters of pure precepts" soon became the foundation of precepts in Esoteric Buddhism, as illustrated in an important Esoteric text entitled "Master Śubhākarasiṃha's Elements of Meditation" (*Wuwei sanzang chanyao* 無畏三藏禪要)[149]. According to this "Elements of Meditation," the most important thing for receiving bodhisattva precepts is to initiate and maintain the mind of enlightenment 菩提心 (Sk. *bodhicitta*).

---

148 Explanations can be found in the Yogācāra scriptures: *Dichi jing* (*Bodhisattvabhūmi)*, T 30: 910b-c; *Yuqie shidi lun* (*Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*), T 30: 511a.

149 Written by Śubhākarasiṃha and Jingxian 敬賢 during 716-735 in Chang'an. For a concise introduction to these texts, see Ōno (1954: 431-435).

With the same rationale, another Esoteric text "Text for the Highest Vehicle Initiation of Bodhisattva Mind Precept and Repentance" (*Zuishangshengjiao shoufa putixinjie chanhuiwen* 最上乘教受發菩提心戒懺悔文, T 915: 941a) is also devoted to explaining how one receives the precepts, initiates the arising of the mind of enlightenment (*faputi xin* 發菩提心, Sk. *bodhicittotpāda*), and then acts out repentance. Repentance of previous sins is essential for purifying one's mind in this regard. After receiving the Bodhisattva precepts, one should continue to practise meditation and the "four types of samādhi" (four contemplation practices). These all show that the practices of meditation, repentance and precepts are all necessary in the process of the purification of mind. The emphasis on mind and purification share the same ground in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra.* According to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra,* the peaceful state of a practitioner is determined by a "non-thinking" mind.[150] This follows the statement in the *Satyasiddhi-śāstra* (*Chengshi lun* 成實論, T32: 290a19-b10) introduced to China in an early stage of the Mahāyāna-Hīnayāna debate. The *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* in its origin a "dharma gate for the mind-sphere," is in this sense complementary to the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.[151] The Mahāyāna characteristics of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* lie in its claim that any sentient being in possession of a mind could achieve Buddha's attainment right

---

150 (一切性無性非無性，但覺自心現量，妄想不生，安隱快樂，世事永息。) (T16: 507b9-11)

151 (我本源蓮花藏世界盧舍那佛所說心地法門) (T24: 1003c5)

upon receiving the Mahāyāna precepts.[152] Furthermore, the *Brahmā's Net*'s precepts are very convenient for all practitioners because the purest precepts could be conferred simply through comprehending the words of dharma masters.[153] The same idea is taken by the "Original Acts that Serve as Necklaces for the Bodhisattvas" as meaning that the Bodhisattva precepts are imperishable ever since their conferral ceremony. (T24: 1021b2; b22.)

The inward-looking tendency concerning Mahāyāna precepts conferral was incorporated into the discussions on the relationship between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna. The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* first proposes its "non-vehicle" and "one-vehicle" theory within the context of the disputation. (T16: 497) It corresponds to the universalism of the "oneness" and "one-vehicle" in the *Lotus Sūtra*, a concept which was popular in China (if not India) from the outset.[154] Unsurprisingly, the term "supreme vehicle" (*zuishangsheng* 最上乘) often occurs conjointly with the term "single mind" in Chinese writings. The "supreme vehicle" refers to the Mahāyāna bodhisattva's path, with *prajñā* associations, which explains the frequent appearance of this term in passages in the literature of the mid-Tang concerning the doctrines of *Prajñā*, Chan and Esoteric Buddhism.[155] At a doctrinal level the "supreme vehicle" then developed into the following interpretations:

---

[152] (一切有心者, 皆應攝佛戒, 眾生受佛戒, 即入諸佛位) (T24:1004a19-20)

[153] (但解法師語。盡受得戒。皆名第一清淨者。) (T24: 1004b10)

[154] Jan Nattier (2003), *A Few Good Men: the Bodhisattva Path according to the Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, p. 88.

[155] For example, it appears in: *Dasheng lichu liupolomiduo jing* 大乘理趣六波羅蜜多經 (T 261: 898a), *Dunwu rudao yaomen lun* 頓悟入道要門論 (X63,

a.) The Esoteric tradition regards the bodhisattva approach as the highest, and hence an initiation ritual, the conferment of bodhisattva precepts, is mandatory.

b.) According to the *Laṅkāvatāra*, the "supreme vehicle" is dedicated to the realisation of the "perfect realisation of own-nature" (圓成實自性).

c.) In the later "Southern Chan" context, it refers to sudden enlightenment as a realisation of *prajñā*, and it implies that someone who takes the "Supreme Vehicle" approach will eventually become enlightened in an intuitive leap.

None of these disparate approaches challenge any fundamental presumption of the bodhisattva approach. The conjoint occurrence of it and the "single mind" strengthens the "one practice samādhi" as a form of meditation, just as propagated in the ninth century by Zongmi. It seems that the "supreme vehicle" does not have a fixed definition, and its occurrence, as Yanagida (1967: 466; 470, note 16) noticed, demonstrates the encounter between Chan and Esoteric Buddhism.

At this point, the reason why the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* were grouped together and occurred as a repetitive pattern in most of the Japanese bibliographies of the ninth century becomes clear. In various traditions of

---

No.1223: 18ab), *Luizu dashi fabao tanjing* 六祖大師法寶壇經 (T 2008：350c), and *Zhudasheng rulengqie jing* 注大乘入楞伽經 (T 39: 453c). Also in Tang literati's writings, see: Li Hua's 李華 (d. 766?) *Gu Zuoxi dashi bei,* 故左溪大師碑 (*QTW* 320), and Bai Juyi's 白居易 (772 – 846) *Xijing Xingshansi chuan fatang beiming*, 西京興善寺傳法堂碑銘 (*QTW* 678).

Buddhist schools, it seems that, concerning the purification of one's mind, meditation and precepts are two sides of the same coin. This association was not a feature exclusively of either Chan or Esoteric Buddhism; rather, it was a common perception and praxis that developed in tandem with the development of the Mahāyāna in Chinese Buddhist history. This thread of perception continued to develop into various forms, among which Chan Buddhism became a distinct tradition.

2. Bodhisattva Ideal according to Huisi

Huisi's vision of the precepts is consistent with his emphasis on meditation, on the basis that the perfection of wisdom comes from meditation, not from studying Buddhist scriptures. The previous chapter has analysed the influence of his ideas on meditation, and this chapter focuses on the fact that his promotion of the "formless practice" in meditation and in Bodhisattva precepts was in fact the foundation of the *Platform Sūtra*. Huisi's idea of "free consciousness samādhi" (*suiziyi sanmei* 隨自意三昧) moulded the subsequent development of the "formless precepts" and "formless repentance" in Zhiyi's *Mohe zhiguan* (T 46: 14a) and the *Platform Sūtra*.[156] Parallels are found in the conception of Xinxing's monastic rules as mentioned in the previous chapter. As mentioned in Chapter Two, regarding Xinxing's monasticism as a trend that ran in

---

[156] According to Lewis Lancaster, it is very likely that this idea originated from the Tiantai tradition but found a wider audience when it was picked up by the Chan School. Lewis Lancaster (1989), "The terminology of the *Platform Sūtra* in the Chinese Buddhist Canon", in *Fo Kuang Shan Report of International Conference on Ch'an Buddhism*, pp. 51-54.

parallel with Chan's exhortations of "cessation of thought" and "mindlessness" in the eighth-century documents, Xinxing actually mentions the formless samādhi in his *Zhi fa*. (Nishimoto 1998: 579; Hubbard 2001:20; Benn 2001: 28) The wider context has been stressed in this chapter because it is important to bear in mind that there was as yet no single group possessing distinctive characteristics such that it could be called the "Chan School" yet. The parallels above illustrate the fact that the concerns of mind precepts and the tendency of formless practice existed within and without the Chan tradition. The rhetoric of the decline of Buddhism resulted in a particular way of conceptualising the correct mentality for the decaying clergy. In the context of reworking Mahāyāna precepts in fifth-sixth century China as presented above, Huisi's interpretation of the bodhisattva ideal is innovative and marks a turning point in the reception of Mahāyāna in sixth century China. It is impossible, however, to understand Huisi's period without realising that it was a society where the pressure of imperial patronage, wars and other sufferings, all spurred anxiety. Constant wars in northern China during the early sixth century fuelled ordinary people's fear as well as Buddhist monks' despair over the end of the Dharma. Pessimism in Buddhism, however, was counterbalanced by the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (the *Nirvana Sūtra*, Ch. *Niepan jing* 涅槃經, Jp. Nehankyō, T12, no. 374), which encouraged protection by a kingship associated with Bodhisattva-hood. On the other hand, when the Buddhist order found protection under the laity and royal patrons, the institution faced a crisis in maintaining its internal religious integrity. The popularity of the Mādhyamaka in China complicated the matter even further. If the precepts are in accordance with *śūnyatā* (*bijing kong* 畢竟空), it is difficult to have any fixed

criteria to assign blame when a bodhisattva trespasses against the precepts. Following the doctrine of *śūnyatā,* the behaviour of bodhisattvas might appear brutal, showing no compassion, and while the mind remains pure and integral. Hence it is difficult for secular eyes to fathom the rationale whereby bodhisattvas could employ skilful means for the elimination of dangerous beings in order to protect Buddhism for all other people's benefit. According to this train of thought, karmic retribution exists not as it is conventionally understood, but quite clearly in accordance with *śūnyatā*.

According to Huisi's *Vows*, he was oppressed because of his preaching on the Mahāyāna teachings. Under the subtitle "What does the Bodhisattva practice mean?" (*yunhe ming pusa xingchu* 云何名菩薩行處, T 46: 701b10) in his "Commentary to the Chapter on Serene and Pleasing Activities in the *Lotus Sūtra*" (*Fahua jing anlexing yi* 法華經安樂行義, T46, No. 1926) one can find his radical view of Mahāyāna precepts that the great persistence of bodhisattvas in skilful means (*pusa dafangbian ren* 菩薩大方便忍, T46: 701c20) should incorporate skills for taming (*tiaofu* 調伏) and killing devils in order to protect the Buddhist Dharma.[157] Since this way of thinking is not far from that of those rebellious farmers in Hebei province who legitimated killing with the notion of

[157] This idea is legitimated by Kāśyapa Buddha (迦葉佛) and Master Juede 覺德法師 in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*. (T46: 701c12) See the annotation and translation of this passage on the bodhisattva's persistence against the evil in Daniel Stevenson and Hiroshi Kanno (2006), *The Meaning of the Lotus Sutra's Course of Ease and Bliss*, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, p. 279.

bodhisattvahood, it is possible that Huisi's provocative interpretation of *śūnyatā* caused some tension among Buddhist communities.[158] Given the social circumstances, it is not difficult to imagine that Chinese monks from other groups would have regarded Huisi's followers as a subversive force.

The way in which Huisi accentuates an ambitious Mahāyāna attitude, acting rather like a Buddha himself, would have seemed a rather provocative statement to his contemporaries.[159] With a donation to make a golden-script *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra,* he made a vow to attain enlightenment. (T46: 790a-b.) According to the vow he made, he would receive homage from all other beings whoever call his name, just like the magical effect described in "Universal Gate Section" (*Pumen pin* 普門品) of the *Lotus Sūtra*. The reason for the oppression of Huisi was very likely due to this radical stance about the extent to which a bodhisattva could play a role in society and the state, which Kawakatsu terms "bodhisattva practitioner in society" (*Zaiya teki bosatsu gyōja* 在野的菩薩行者). (Kawakatsu 1982: 501) His identification with the bodhisattva ideal occupies an

---

[158] About the "Mahāyāna rebellions" in the Northern Wei in 515 A.D., see Kawakatsu Yoshio 川勝義雄 (1982), "Chūgokuteki shinbukkyō keisei e no enerugi- : Nangaku Eishi no baai" 中国的新仏教形成へのエネルギー：南岳慧思の場合, in Fukunaga Mitsuji ed., *Chūgoku chūsei no shūkyō to bunka,* pp. 501-538, especially p. 522.

[159] It is interesting to note that, when it was important to survive in difficult times, the concept of taming the opponents seems to have been prevalent. For instance, the eighth century figure Moheyan had a significance beyond the concept of sudden enlightenment in that his Buddhist name was *Xiangmo* 降魔 which, literally, means "taming the devil." See Yanagida Seizan (1985: 260). Moheyan was Shenxiu's disciple in eighth century Chang'an, see Li Yong's 李邕 (678 - 747) inscription written in 730 in Hunan Province. Yanagida (1967: ix- xi).

essential part in Huisi's religious thought, and his concern with the Bodhisattva precepts is understandable in this context. Taken together, Huisi's worries over the decline of Buddhism influenced his idea of the bodhisattva ideal and his promotion of formless practices. Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667), with the same motivation, took a rather different approach.

3. Daoxuan's Concept of the "Ordination Platform"

As has been mentioned in the previous chapter, Daoxuan's vision of *Jetavana* encouraged activities furthering the establishment of ordination platforms all over China. It is emphasised in this chapter that, in Daoxuan's eyes, the ordination ceremony and the physical ordination platform represented a wellspring of supernatural, almost occult power deriving from Śākyamuni. The vision of *Jetavana* enabled an intense feeling of a direct connection with the Buddha in spite of his absence.

The ordination platform is a central theme in Daoxuan's writings. His "Account of the Spiritual Response Phenomenon of Vinaya" (*Lüxiang gantong zhuan* 律相感通傳, T45, no. 1898) explicates his historiography combined with sacred geography, where he spells out that the transmission of Buddhism had relied on stupas throughout history since ancient times. In a mention of Kāśyapa 迦葉佛 and Emperor Mu of the Zhou 周穆王, the stupas (塔), as he defines them, are ordination platforms (壇), which preserved the viability of the Dharma for hundreds of years. (T45: 875b) He argues that the precepts provide the very point

of derivation for Buddhism, and so could not be varied ever since their genesis.[160] It is made clear to us that the monastic law is the remedy for the reputation of clergy during the dark age of the end of dharma, and ordination platforms are the antidote which guarantee Buddhist transmission during the absence of the Buddha. This formulation concerning the relationship between Chinese Buddhists and the distant Buddha finds an analogy in Xinxing's promotion of the "mute sheep monks," who could be the role model for us who live on the periphery of the Buddhist world where a contact with the true Dharma is no longer possible. The difference between them, however, lies in Daoxuan's visionary ordination platform. Daoxuan crafted the perception of the ordination platform with an imaginative fervour which was then picked up by Chan Buddhists, for the symbolic platform offers a direct access to the Buddha.[161]

Given the notable ordination platform in Daoxuan's vision, it does not surprise us that the legends regarding the transmission of Buddha's tooth from India to China are consistently connected with him: he reportedly received the relic of Buddha's tooth during a nocturnal visitation from a divinity. The deity is generally identified as Skanda (Ch. *Weituo tian*, Jp. *Idaten* 韋陀天), who delivered the tooth to Daoxuan out of gratitude for his imparting the three refuges and eight precepts.[162] Just as with miracles and as with mementos of lineage,

---

[160] 戒為佛法之初源，本立而不可傾也。 (T45: 881b.)

[161] As Yanagida (1985: 209) suggests, the authors of the Platform Scripture entitled it after the pattern of Daoxuan's *Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing* **關中創立戒壇圖經** (Illustrated Scripture of the Ordination Platform in Central China).

[162] For the connections and Daoxuan's vision of relics, see Koichi Shinohara (1988), "Two Sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: Stupa Inscriptions and Miracle Stories", in *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*, eds.,

relics serve as signs of lineage or inheritance. (Strong, 2004: 188) At the same time, the transfer of relics reflects the changing attitude towards India as the Buddhist homeland. As Strong (2004: 189) puts it, "once a temple or monk or ruler 'has' the Buddha in the form of a relic, India itself need no longer be visited; in fact, India as the homeland of the Buddha and the Dharma need no longer exist—something that was stated explicitly in later Japanese traditions that likewise emphasize the 'transfer to the East' of the tradition." The concept of "transfer to the East" as a way of legitimation, as the next chapter will illustrate, began quite early in the Chan tradition where Bodhidharma and Bodhisattva precepts serve as the warranty of continuity, performing a role similar to that of the ordination platform for Daoxuan.

4. Daoxuan's Monasticism

During Daoxuan's time, his major worry, driven by the concept of the decline of Buddhism, was a degrading *saṃgha.*[163] According to Daoxuan, the only way to prevent Buddhism from declining was to insist on strict adherence to the *Vinaya* by the monks.[164] Facing the forces endangering the *saṃgha's* reputation, Daoxuan particularly saw himself as a carrier of Buddhist faith and was eager to

---

Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, Oakville, Ont. : Mosaic Press, pp. 119-228, especially pp. 212-24. For the legend in relation to the Chinese concept of relics, see John S. Strong (2004), *Relics of the Buddha*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, pp. 187-90.

[163] 末法時中無清淨僧。(T45: 892a)

[164] Tan Zhihui (2002), *Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana: Imagining a Utopian Monastery in Early Tang*, PhD diss., the Univ. of Arizona, 2002, p. 67.

reverse the decline of Buddhism. His view is rather rigid in enforcing self-discipline and adherence to what he understood to be the original *Vinaya*. This approach is radically different from the Mādhyamika strand. Daoxuan's stern separation of lay people and clergy departed clearly from the thought of the Vimalakīrti.[165] In order to maintain a saintly clergy, he is fastidious about the right format of the ordination platform and monastic constructions where hierarchy and distinctions must be emphasised. In Daoxuan's "Illustrated Scripture of the Ordination Platform in Central China" (*Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing* 關中創立戒壇圖經, T45, no. 1892), he set out the precepts in relation to the virtue of the clergy during the absence of Buddha. (T45: 807a-c) An orderly picture of a righteous clergy is then provided with a vivid description of the display of an imagined perfect monastery in his "Illustrated Scripture of Jetavana Monastery in the Srāvastī Kingdom in Central India" (*Zhong Tianzhu Sheweiguo Qihuansi Tujing* 中天竺舍衛國祇洹寺圖經, T45, no. 1899). In Daoxuan's vision of a perfect monastery, the symbol of *Vinaya* is implemented in several parts of the architecture, and a syncretism of Chinese and Buddhist cosmology is displayed. It is apparent that this sacred space is for the Chinese audience, and yet it is interesting to note that both scriptures highlight his cultural identity. The scripture titles mention China (*Guanzhong*) and India (*Tianzhu*) respectively, and they were

[165] Vimalakīrti, or Weimojie 維摩詰, was renowned as a lay Buddhist who, having mastered the perfection of wisdom, defeated other disciples of the Buddha in debate and thereby subverted the traditional distinction between lay and ordained disciples. For studies of the thought of the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*, see the introduction in Burton Watson's translation from the Chinese version by Kumārajīva, *The Vimalakirti Sutra*. Columbia University Press, 1997.

probably expected to be read jointly. While there was a perfect imaginary Jetavana Monastery in India, an equivalent Buddhist ordination platform was built in central China. Although an Indian connection is not dismissible, an equal status between India and China is stressed.

It is notable that monastic codes often reflect cross-cultural encounters, raising questions of self-image and self-identity for the monks who travelled across countries. In Chapter One we already saw the example of Yijing (635-713) who, upon his return from India, shifted his concern immediately to the institutional issues regarding the monastic life and began translating the *vinaya* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda*. This process of reworking the monastic codes involves doctrinal separation, establishing distinctions and finding coherence within Buddhist and cultural contexts. Even in India, the *vinayas* were not unified since the outset.[166] Because the monastic regulations differed according to time and region, the multi-cultural character of Buddhism was magnified in the reworking and radical modifications of the *vinayas*. Such encounters seem to have boosted the self-identity of Buddhist monks, which are revealed in their commentaries on the *vinayas*.

At the domestic level, Daoxuan's cultural identity was also a reflection of the political environment of the Tang Dynasty as a whole. The period Daoxin and Daoxuan lived in was the start of the Tang Empire, when regulation and order for society and the monasteries were primary concerns of the emperors. Emperor

[166] The discrepancy arose in India since the *saṃgha* was divided into the *Sthaviravāda* and the *Mahāsāṃghika*, and then six major *vinayas* were developed and observed by Buddhists.

Gaozu 高祖 of Tang (565-635, r.618-626) held court debates about the priority of Daoism and Buddhism, in which Daoism gained the advantage. Then Emperor Taizong 太宗 (599-649) enforced the "*Law of the Zhenguan Era*" (*Zhenguan lu* 貞觀律) and the strict law for the clergy "*Daoseng ge*" (道僧格). Emperor Gaozu built the famous *Ximing si* 西明寺 and Daoxuan became the abbot. This indicates that Chinese monasticism was still seeking for a way to function properly.[167] The purpose of Daoxuan's *Tujing* was obviously to set a standard for the monastic institution, which finds a parallel in a non-Buddhist context: the standardisation of state sacrificial ceremonies at the regional level.[168] Despite the tension between Buddhist leaders and Tang rulers, since they were both facing ethnic tensions on the border, establishing an overarching cultural identity was a common interest. The efforts Daoxuan and the Tang emperors made to institutionalise the clergy

---

[167] Buddhist institutionalisation was shaped by its competition and confrontation with Daoism. Yanagida (1985: 193) suggests that Daoxuan probably wrote the above mentioned works under pressure of the political influence of Daoists.

[168] It should be noted that *Tujing* 圖經 was not exclusive to Buddhist usage. According to Lei Wen the *Tujing* gradually became the foundation of legislation for the rituals performed by local officials. Hence the institutional aspect is the most important implication of the term *Tujing*. Lei Wen 雷 聞, *Jiaomiao zhiwai: Sui Tang guojia jisi yu zongjiao* 郊廟之外—隋唐國家祭祀與宗教, Beijing: Shenghuo, dushu, xinzhi sanlian shudian, 2009, p. 266. Cf. T. H. Barrett (2002), "Inner and Outer Ritual: Some Remarks on a Directive Concerning Daoist Dragon-casting Ritual from Dunhuang", in Lee Cheuk Yin and Chan Man Sing, eds, *Daoyuan binfen lu / a Daoist florilegium: a festschrift dedicated to Professor Liu Ts'un-yan on his eighty-fifth birthday*, Xianggang: Shangwu yinshuguan, pp. 315-334. This examines a Dunhuang document specifying consultation of the *tujing* for Daoist rituals. Barrett (2005) also suggests that rivalry with the Daoists during the Tang Dynasty would have pushed Buddhists in certain directions.

was part of a larger context of the sinicisation of Buddhism. Even though the voice of Daoxuan was rather severe, the majority of reinterpretations of the Mahāyāna precepts were made to suit the driving force of the expansion of lay followers.[169] Thus his work found a contrast in the tendency to simplification for the laity's convenience within Chinese Buddhism.[170]

5. Simplification of Rituals for the Laity

The *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* was probably compiled sometime between 440 and 480, several decades after the translation of the full *Vinayas* of the *Sarvāstivāda* and Mahāsamghika schools during the early fifth century.[171] Around

---

[169] Paul Groner notices that Chinese and Japanese aristocracy and rulers did not like to observe the precepts they found inconvenient. In this sense, reinterpretations of the formless precepts could eliminate all the inconveniencies, as in the case of Annen.

[170] The tension between rigid adherence to the precepts and "free consciousness" towards them is well illustrated in an apocryphal eleventh century tale. (T 50: 715c26-29; 791b1-5.) According to the story, Śubhākarasiṃha visited the Ximing Monastery where Daoxuan lived. Daoxuan was disturbed by this esoteric master's actions with no adherence to the vinayas whatsoever. One night, as Daoxuan was about to crush a bug, Śubhākarasiṃha called out from another room, "*Vinaya* master, why are you about to kill one of the children of the Buddha's?" Immediately Daoxuan realised that Śubhākarasiṃha was no ordinary man and honoured him. This story is apocryphal because Śubhākarasiṃha did not come to China until forty-nine years after Daoxuan's death. Paul Groner (1990), "The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*", in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed., Robert Buswell, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 251-290, cited here pp.. 256; 260.

[171] For the background to the compilation of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, see Paul

this time Dharmakṣema (384-433) and Gunavarman (367-431) had translated several texts on the Bodhisattva precepts, so the Chinese interest in the precepts was at a peak. On the other hand, the increased ideological friction between Buddhism and Confucianism was a matter of concern to Chinese monks like Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–416). Buddhist customs, such as celibacy and shaving the head, were criticised for being contrary to Confucian filial piety. Out of this difficult situation, the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, probably of Chinese origin, may have been compiled with the hope of ameliorating the conflict.[172] The forty-eight minor precepts prohibited Buddhists from obtaining the trust of the rulers by means of Buddhism, and the relationship between the government and the Buddhist Order was clearly a matter of concern. Following Huiyuan's stance in his "On Why Monks Do Not Bow Down Before Kings" (*Shamen bujing wangzhe lun* 沙門不敬王者論, 404 A.D.), the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* insisted on the autonomy of the Buddhist Order. Even if later commentators may have reinterpreted the text in dramatically different ways for their own ends, the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* reflected church-state relations in the fifth century.

The sixth century saw a new relationship between the Order and laity, because of the notorious corruption in the monasteries of northern China and craving for merit accumulation in southern China. It led to despair over the clergy

---

Groner (1990), "The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku"*, in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha,* ed., Robert Buswell, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 253-256.

[172] For an example of the mention of filial piety see T24: 1004a-b.

and reformation was called for. As mentioned before, Huisi's voice can be regarded as of the same kind: he advocated real practice as a counter-balance against arrogant scholasticism in the monasteries of the capital. There were attempts to produce new interpretations of the legitimacy of transmission, and self-ordination is one of them, devised to fit it into the specific circumstances of the sixth century. Huisi's dream of receiving ordination from an Indian master makes it clear to us that masters are replaced by a mystical lineage presumed to link to the Buddha directly. The self-ordination is the most noticeable feature of popular *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, which was naturally attractive to the Chinese audience. Although the Chinese seem to have begun to get a full grip of Indian *vinayas* in the fifth century, the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* did not take the lion's share of attention in China, especially in its southern part, until the commentaries by Zhiyi and Fazang came out. The ordination ceremony derived from the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* was not exclusive in any sects in China and was employed by a variety of Chan groups.[173] It seems that Daoxin's *Pusa jiefa* 菩薩戒法 was the shared model of this type of precept conferral ceremony. (Yanagida 1967: 186) Daoxin's work is not extant any more but it demonstrates an effort to revise existent precepts with Mahāyāna insights.[174] The Bodhisattva precepts rituals that Zhiyi performed for the Sui

---

[173] Tanaka Ryōshō 田中良昭 (1983), *Tonkō Zenshū bunken no kenkyū* 敦煌禅宗文献の研究, Tōkyō : Daitō Shuppansha, 1983, p. 465; McRae (1987), "Shen-hui and the Teaching of Sudden Enlightenment," in *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, ed., Peter N. Gregory, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987, pp. 259-260, note 4.

[174] David Chappell (1983), "The Teachings of the Fourth Ch'an Patriarch Tao-hsin (580-651) ," in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, eds. Lewis Lancaster and Whalen Lai, , Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, p. 90.

emperors were influential in tightening the relationship between Buddhism and the ruling class.[175] In this regard, it is quite clear that adaptations of existent views of precepts were needed due to the changing social environment.

The evidence shows that various groups of Buddhists attempted to rework the precepts, and that the precepts of the *Platform Sūtra* were not produced within the Chan tradition. The *Platform Sūtra* reveals a new social relationship between the clergy and the mundane world. As David Chappell's comparative study of the "formless repentance" concludes, there were no distinctive *Chan* qualities to define the bodhisattva's virtues in the *Platform Sūtra*, which rather represents a lower stage of practice for ordinary people.[176] In other words, the *Platform Sūtra* represented a simplified version, mainly for the increasing numbers of lay followers.[177] Since the clergy has turned their target to the lay patrons, instead of a small amount of elite members, a new format of precepts was needed for the wider audience. Paul Groner's study on the ordination ceremony of the *Platform Sūtra* sheds light on the continuing process of simplification of

---

[175] Zhiyi's services for the aristocrats and the rulers encouraged the idea of "Bodhisattva-monks" (*pusa seng* 菩薩僧), which forms a separate category in the history of Buddhism, *Da Song sengshi lue* (大宋僧史略), by Zanning 贊寧 (919 - 1001). (T 54: 252c-253a) However, the controversial idea regarding the "Bodhisattva-monks" faded away later on. Cf. Jinhua Chen (2002c), "*Pusaseng* (Bodhisattva-monks): A Peculiar Monastic Institution at the Turn of the Northern Zhou (557-581) and Sui Dynasties (581-618)", in *Journal of Chinese Religions* 30 (2002), 1-22.

[176] David Chappell (1989), "Formless Repentance in Comparative Perspective", in *Fo Kuang Shan Report of International Conference on Ch'an Buddhism*, pp. 251-67.

[177] Yanagida (1969), *Zen no goroku* 禅の語録, vol. 8, Tokyo: Tsukuma shobō, p. 189.

ordination ceremonies and precepts in medieval China.[178] Similarly, Shenxiu's "Gateway to the Mahāyāna Skilful Means for Non-Birth" shows an attempt to control an expanding order. (Yanagida 1985: 364) From this aspect, this text, Daoxin's "Manual of the Rules of Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral" and the *Platform Sūtra* followed a thread of practical social concern. Surprisingly, despite their occasional discussions of doctrinal questions, the central issue of all these texts was the Buddhist *vinaya*, a rather abstract kind of topic.

As self-ordination reached its pinnacle of popularity, and no specific qualifications were required for the newly ordained monks, Chinese Buddhists began to recognise the drawback of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* namely that it became more difficult to govern the Order. This became a new task for monks such as Shenxiu and Shenhui, and we can see below how they tried to solve the problem through their "Gateway to the Mahāyāna Skilful Means for Non-Birth and the Platform Dialogue."

6. Reductionism in the *Platform Sūtra*

Now that the context of the Bodhisattva precept tradition in China and its relationship to meditation has been introduced, let us turn our focus to the more relevant Chan texts. There are three important Chan texts in which the conferral ritual for Bodhisattva precept constitutes a focal point**:**

---

[178] Paul Groner (1989), "The Ordination Ritual in the Platform Sūtra within the Context of the East Asian Buddhist Vinaya Tradition", in *Fo Kuang Shan Report of International Conference on Ch'an Buddhism,* pp. 220-50.

A. "Gateway to the Mahāyāna Skilful Means for Non-Birth" (*Dasheng wusheng fangbian men* 大乘無生方便門, T 85, no. 2834), hereafter "*Gateway*."

B. Dunhuang manuscript "Platform Dialogue on the Sudden Teachings and the Chan Branch's Direct Realisation of the Essence by Monk Nanyang (Shenhui)*"* (*Nanyang heshang dunjiao jietuo chanmen zhiliaoxing tanyu* 南陽和上頓教解脫禪門直了性壇語), hereafter "*Platform Dialogue."*[179]

C. Dunhuang manuscript "The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch" 敦煌本六祖壇經, with the full title "The Highest Mahāyāna Mahā-Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra of the Southern School's Sudden Teachings" (*Nazong dunjiao zuishang dasheng mohe po're poluomi jing* 南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅密經, T 48, no. 2007, cf. no. 2008), hereafter "*Platform Sūtra*." [180]

In a careful comparison of these three texts, conducted by Satō Tatsugen (1986: 391-8), some nuanced doctrinal explanations can be found. Shenhui's "*Platform Dialogue*" is very similar to the "*Gateway*", the latter as a representative of the "Northern Chan" teachings. This similarity may seem ironic to some Chan followers because Shenhui was known to severely criticise the "Northern Chan" School. It seems that the underlying discourse is actually a reworking of the Bodhisattva precepts through the theme of the approach to the attainment of pure

---

[179] *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集, vol. 3,Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1999-2003, pp. 308-9.

[180] It is worth noting that the sub-title of this scripture runs: 六祖惠能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經一卷兼受無相戒，弘法弟子法海集記. Thus the original title informs us that the ceremony was bound up with its theory of the formless precepts.

mind. As Yanagida (1985: 364) suggested, the purpose of the *Gateway* was to suggest a new method for the conferral rituals of Bodhisattva precepts, and this reformation of precepts continued to be a key theme in Shenhui's writings. In fact, the similarities in format and content found in the three texts suggest that writers all had the same purpose in devising the ordination ritual with increasing consideration for the laity. Furthermore, the similarities in the ordination ritual presented in the three texts suggest that the compiler of the *Platform Sūtra* drew upon the ritual employed by a variety of groups.[181] The model for this shared ordination ceremony may have been Daoxin's "Manual of the Rules of Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral", which may be regarded as reflecting the need to set some rules for the expanding number of his followers. (Chappell 1983: 90; Groner 1989: 246).

Shenhui's attack on the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and his promotion of the *Platform Sūtra* took place during a time when activities for the purpose of establishing ordination platforms vied with each other all over China. An activist in this regard, for example, was Huineng's disciple Yinzong 印宗 (627 – 713) in the Jiangnan area. It is noticeable that Daoxuan's "Illustrated Scripture" (*Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing*) also attracted increasing numbers of Chinese readers. Despite Shenhui's attempt to separate the *Diamond Sūtra* from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, the fundamental thesis regarding the Bodhisattva Precepts remains similar and goes back to its roots in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* in China. It is rarely noticed that the word "diamond" in the title *Diamond Sūtra* refers to the

[181] See Paul Groner (1989: 245), and a comparative chart of these ordination rituals in Tanaka Ryōshō (1983: 464-5).

"diamond precious precepts" (*jin'gang baojie* 金剛寶戒) in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* and constitutes a doctrinal base for the justification of self-ordination, i.e. by one's own vows. (Yanagida 1985: 216) It is likely that the authors of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* had the *Diamond Sūtra* in mind when coining their notion of the "diamond precious precepts". This set of precepts is doctrinally identical to the "formless precepts of the sphere of mind" (無相心地戒) which are incorporated into Chan Buddhism. (Yanagida 1985: 217) Yanagida (1985: 224) goes further, suggesting that the *Diamond Sūtra* means not much more than the "diamond precious precepts," and therefore could be regarded as part of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. Judging from his stance towards the mind-precepts, Shenhui's "*Platform Dialogue*" follows the same strand under the influence of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*.[182] Yanagida (1985: 242) also suggests that Yongjia Xuanjue's 永嘉玄覺 (665-713) "Meditation Master Caoxi's Song of Buddha-Nature" (*Caoxi chanshi foxing ge* 曹溪禪師佛性歌), also called the "Song of Supreme-Vehicle Buddha-Nature" (*Zuishangsheng foxing ge* 最上乘佛性歌) or the "Song of Meditation Master Caoxi's Attainment of Buddhahood" (*Caoxi chanshi zhengdaoge* 曹溪禪師證道歌), was derived from the concept of the "original Buddha-nature"

[182] Yanagida (1985: 212) also notices that Shenhui's idea of the Bodhisattva precepts in the *Platform Dialogue* partly came from the *Shou lengyan jing* 首楞嚴經.

(*benyuan foxing* 本源佛性) in relation to the "precepts of the sphere of mind" (*xindi jie* 心地戒) in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*.

On the other hand, in terms of difference, the third text, the *Platform Sūtra,* departed from the other two in its increasing emphasis on the "formless precepts" (*wuxiang jie* 無相戒). (T48: 346b22; 347a11) This difference corresponds to the debate set off by Shenhui against the idea of "guarding the mind" on a gradual basis, which is then identified with the "Northern School" as a substantiation of the competition between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Platform Sūtra*. This argument supports a transformation from the idea of "mind precepts" (through "guarding the mind") towards the "formless precepts." From the opening statement of the *Platform Sūtra*, it is clear that the setting was designed for a lay audience, although monks could also be present. The quality of being formless, like the idea in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, enabled an easier precept conferral, so that Huineng could confer Bodhisattva precepts on a large audience numbering hundreds or more. Not surprisingly, the text goes on to claim that ever since the *Platform Sūtra* was transcribed, the text alone can represent Patriarch Huineng and grant the formless precepts.[183] In both an institutional and practical sense, this revolutionary idea is a development in the perception of the ordination ritual. Equally important is the fact that this shift shows a tendency towards the simplification of Buddhism in China, which formed an ideology useful for the political leadership.

[183] (T48:343c13) (得遇壇經者, 如見吾親授。)

The Tang rulers were adept at manipulating religious sources for their political ends.[184] One particularly important ruler of this kind is Emperor Xuanzong 玄宗 (685-762, r.712-756) known for his forceful religious policy and his strong inclination toward Daoism.[185] As the rebellion of Empress Wei was put down, Xuanzong's rise to power began a new phase for the Buddhists, the prosperity of the Kaiyuan Era steadily grew, and it emerged that the Seventh Chan Patriarch was to be Shenhui.[186] The emergence of Shenhui was largely decided by Emperor Xuanzong's selective preferences. Xuanzong's restriction of translation activities had created an unfavourable environment for scholar monks who specialised in exegetical studies of Sanskrit scriptures. Xuanzong's hostile attitude towards Indian monks had caused a significant decrease in the number of translations from Sanskrit originals.[187] As an outcome of such a reserved attitude

[184]It is evident particularly in their use of rituals to fortify a state ideology, such as Gaozong and Empress Wu's worship at Mt. Tai. See Lei Wen (2009); T. H. Barrett (1996), *Taoism under the T'ang: Religion and Empire during the Golden Age of Chinese History*, London : Wellsweep, 1996, especially pages 29–30 about Emperor Gaozong and the ritual at Mt. Tai.

[185] For Xuanzong's policies towards Buddhism, see Stanley Weinstein, 1987), *Buddhism under the T'ang*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 51-7; Tonami Mamoru 礪波護 (1982), "Tō chūki no Bukkyō to kokka" 唐中期の佛教と国家, in *Chūgoku chūsei no shūkyō to bunka* 中國中世の宗教と文化, ed., Fukunaga Mitsuji 福永光司, Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo, 1982, pp. 589-651.

[186] For the development of Shenhui's group in relation to Xuanzong's rule, see Yanagida (1985: 174). For the religious events which led to a change in the attitude towards the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices" (*Erru sixing lun*) and the *Vajrasamādhi Sūtra,* see Yanagida (1985: 114).

[187] Antonello Palumbo, "Sending the Alien Monks back to the Marchlands: a Forgotten Nationalisation of Buddhism in Tang China", unpublished manuscript.

towards foreign monks and Buddhism, Xuanzong's religious policy seems to have encouraged a remarkable degree of sense of legitimacy among Chinese Buddhists in the eighth century.[188]

On the other hand, despite the strict policy towards Buddhism, Xuanzong was particularly interested in some Buddhist sūtras, such as the *Diamond Sūtra* (*Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* 金剛般若經) and the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra for Humane Kings* (*Renwang po're jing* 仁王般若經).[189] The *Prajñā* texts enjoyed imperial patronage during the eighth century and facilitated the popularity of sudden enlightenment theory, which corresponded to the tendency towards simplifying practices. It is fairly understandable that Xuanzong had paid special attention to these scriptures, particularly the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra for Humane Kings*, for it provided him with some sort of ideal type for political leadership, as the scripture title already explains itself. The promotion of the perfection of wisdom coincided with Shenhui's campaign to elevate the *Diamond Sūtra*, which

---

[188] Esoteric monks, such as Śubhākarasiṃha and Vajrabodhi (金剛智) (671–741), were exceptions to Xuanzong's policy for foreign monks. (Weinstein, 1989: 54-7)

[189] Xuanzong commanded distribution of his commentaries on the "Classic of Filial Piety" (*Xiao jing* 孝經), the *Daode jing* (道德經) and the *Diamond Sūtra* during the Kaiyuan Era. This act of choosing and standardising representative texts of Confucianism, Daoism and Buddhism respectively was to demonstrate his equal patronage of the three religions. (Tonami, 1982: 642) Meanwhile, Xuanzong ordered Amoghavajra 不空 (705-774) to translate and lecture on the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra for Humane Kings*, see Amoghavajra's biography in Yuanzhao's 圓照 *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄, T55: 885b. For a study of this scripture and its influence in China, see Charles D. Orzech (1998), *Politics and Transcendent Wisdom: the Scripture for Humane Kings in the Creation of Chinese Buddhism*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

is doctrinally closer to Mādhyamaka than is the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra.* Naturally, the emperor's attitude fortified the tendency to replace the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* with the *Diamond Sūtra*. As a result, the Buddhist discourses in the ninth century China moved in a direction which matched Xuanzong's preferences. The imperial patronage of the *Diamond Sūtra*, the *Prajñā* texts and the theory of sudden enlightenment were a determinant factor in the competition between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Platform Sūtra,* while the arguments for this competition have been found in the three Bodhisattva precepts conferment documents as just discussed.

The three texts regarding the Bodhisattva precepts conferral ceremony indicate a movement toward formless practice. This tendency to simplification was formulated as a unique religious ideology reflecting the political concerns of Buddhist monks over East Asia. As Griffith Foulk argues, the doctrine of the "awareness of the non-arising of phenomena" (Skt. *Anutpattikadharmaksānti*, Ch. *Wusheng faren* 無生法忍) as the highest reaches of Mahāyāna experience played an important role in expanding the scope of Chan.[190] In so doing, Chan Buddhism, not limiting itself to a purely contemplative role of meditation, was freed from the constraints of its Indian origin. It thus allowed Chan Buddhism to become a complete religious and ideological system in its own right (Foulk 1987: 117-8), but in a much later period. This argument is drawn from Robert Buswell, who further argues that Chan was part and parcel of a wider trend during the fifth through the eighth centuries to sinicize Buddhism. The *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine and the

---

[190] T. Griffith Foulk (1987), *The Ch'an School and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition*, PhD diss., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

specific type of enlightenment accessible to all had facilitated the spread of Chan ideology. [191] Both Foulk and Buswell see Chan Buddhism as an ideology inseparable from the political concerns of contemporary Buddhist monks. In agreement with them, the Chan doctrines can be considered as a discourse to support religious-political agendas of the imperial court. Under the specific historical circumstances of this time, Chan Buddhism was largely shaped by the sense of legitimacy of East Asian countries. Buswell highlights the tendency towards the sinicization of Buddhism starting from China as one which at the same time stimulated intellectual Korean monks. In fact, in the attempts to adopt Buddhism into one‘s own culture, a domestication of Buddhism occurred in China, Korean and Japan simultaneously during the ninth century. [192] Evidence to be found in China conforms to the trend of the 'domestication' or acculturation of Buddhism in each East Asian country, and the similarities and continuities demand that we see East Asia a whole in this regard. During the ninth century, accompanying the 'domestication' movement within and outside the courts, a rising sense of legitimacy coupled with fervent political intentions is something that permeates the narratives about Chan masters. Given the intense interaction between East Asian countries, Japanese and Korean visitor monks were at first witnesses, and yet, after a short while, they began to appropriate it into their own

---

[191] Robert E. Buswell (1989), *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-sūtra: A Buddhist Apocryphon*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey. P. 10

[192] This took the form of a tendency to 'sinicisation' in China and similar trends in Japan and Silla. Even though the modern nation-state had not yet come into being, the 'domestication' phenomenon bears analogies to the "nationalisation" processes of modern times, and thus features a politicization of Buddhism since an early period.

way of thinking. We will see in the following chapters that, in the ninth century, Japanese and Korean monks who visited China began to cater for their patrons and followers with a strikingly similar religious rhetoric, which incorporates elements from Chan and the precepts, and this rhetoric again reveals the forgotten association between Chan Buddhism and Bodhisattva precepts.

Concluding Remarks

In an attempt to discover the parallels between Chan Buddhism and Mahāyāna precepts, the first part of the discussion was devoted to the doctrinal connection between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*: mind precepts and inward-looking practice. The *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* functions as the doctrinal basis for the simplified precepts in China proper. This characteristic of simplification connects to the formless precepts in Huisi's thought and so again later in the *Platform Sūtra*.

Following this we surveyed Chinese perceptions of the Mahāyāna bodhisattva concept, regarded as the main role model for practitioners, which was formulated during the fifth century. The fifth century is an important period for the Chinese reworking of Mahāyāna doctrines in general and the precepts for the increasing laity in particular. The spread of Bodhisattva precepts in southern China indicates the importance of such a social environment. Consequently however, to make the Buddhist clergy fit well into a society with an increasing number of Buddhist followers, the discourse of the simplification of precepts for the laity went hand in hand with a tendency to place emphasis on mind precepts. As these are still pre-Chan developments, it was necessary to consider the socio-political

environment, and again, Huisi was an important representative figure in our discussion.

The comments on the issues concerning ordination and precept conferral by Daoxuan, Xinxing and Huisi reflected their constant worries about finding themselves in an age of decline of the Dharma and at being at the periphery of the Buddhist world. The rhetoric of decline in Buddhism led to a particular way of conceptualising the correct mentality of *practitioners*, as reflected in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. But it is important to note that this concern for a strongly subjective, inward-looking attitude was not exclusive to Huisi or *chan* masters. Rather, just as Hubbard also observes, it is shared among Xinxing, Daoxuan and the majority of Buddhists. Noticeable is that Huisi's conception of the Bodhisattva ideal, emphasising the categories of bodhisattvas of lesser or greater capacity, finds parallels in Xinxing's redefinition of the "mute sheep monks." Xinxing and Huisi's worries over the decline of Dharma had a far-reaching influence on the formation of Chan Buddhism because of their promotion of the idea of formless practices. Daoxuan, out of the same motivation, took a rather different approach by the creation of a visionary ordination platform and the replacement of the Buddhist mother land of India with China.

Imperial patronage and Buddhist persecutions led to both tensions and interdependence between monastic institutions and the mundane rulers. The leaders of Buddhist communities, in order to maintain the Buddhist order, responded to the complexity of this religious environment in their writings concerning the institutional aspect of Buddhism. Further, the tendency towards having simplified precepts is in accordance with the political climate in both China and Korea.

These two chapters in combination provide an explanation about how and why the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Platform Sūtra* came to constitute the basis of Chan Buddhism, and, moreover, through which channels the figure of Bodhidharma came to enter the repertoire of the Chan legacy.

Chapter Four

The Synthesis of Chan Buddhism and Precepts: Saichō's Perception

This chapter aims to discover how the Japanese reinterpretation of precepts was developed by co-opting the Bodhidharma lineage. This question can be pursued by examining the case of Saichō and his disciples, while the simplification of the doctrinal aspect of the formless precepts was explained in the previous chapter. Here we discuss the continuing synthesis of Chan and precepts in China and Japan. Needless to say, Saichō's understanding was determined by his time in China and further developed in Japan. As will be seen, the patterns of his teaching were broadly similar to those devised in China to meet the problems of the day, not least the strengthening consciousness of the age of the Latter Dharma (*mofa*).

The fluctuation of the varying emphasis on meditation and wisdom was a dominant theme in the rise of the Chan ideal in China during the sixth and seventh centuries, as Chapter Two illustrated. The ideological competition between Buddhist groups was reconciled by the framework of a balanced threefold learning approach. On the other hand, the threefold learning seemed to boost the combination of meditation and precepts with an emphasis on the aspect of "practice" rather than "preaching". This trend is also visible in eighth and ninth century Japan, and is especially obvious in Saichō's writings on Zen and precepts. In other words, Chinese views of Chan and precepts were integrated in Saichō's

understanding. Not only do his bibliographies truly reflect the situation of Chan Buddhism in some parts of China, his ideas of a synthesis of Chan and precepts also reaffirmed the thought of some Chinese masters of the Chan tradition. An analysis of Saichō's perception of Chan and precepts is necessary as he is the author of the bibliographies being examined in the previous chapters; in fact, his learning and reproduction of Buddhism manifests a similar process to the birth of the Chan ideal in China.

Apart from Saichō himself, special attention is given to the role of Chan ideology during cultural encounters between Chinese and Japanese monks. Saichō and his disciples' ideas of Bodhidharma are valuable, because this Indian patriarch stood for a cross-cultural transmission from its outset. Due to intensive interaction between Japanese, Chinese and Korean monks, the multi-cultural character of the Bodhidharma lineage contributed to the cultural identity of Japanese monks.

As discussed in Chapter Three, reinterpretations of the concept of the ordination platform were specially needed whenever institutional legitimacy was put into question due to the recognition of cultural difference. The same applied to the legitimacy of precept conferral; since the authority for this was connected to the Bodhidharma lineage. The figure of Bodhidharma was skilfully adapted into the precept lineage by Japanese Tendai monks, who followed the textual connection first made by Daoxin in his "Manual of Rules of Bodhisattva Precepts," which had turned Bodhidharma into a representative of these precepts.

This chapter starts with the political context of the function of the ordination platform and precepts in Japan. Both cooperation and ethnic tensions

between Buddhist monks from different countries are taken into account in analysing Saichō's background of Buddhist learning. There follows an analysis of the doctrinal continuity from Chinese Chan masters to Saichō. The chapter is then concluded by the use of the figure of Bodhidharma in the legacy of precept conferral. By means of this structure for the chapter an overall picture of Saichō's perception of Chan Buddhism will be provided.

1. Ordination Platforms and the *Kenkairon*

The *Dharmaguptaka vinaya*, which provides a set of conduct regulations, was translated from Sanskrit into Chinese in the fifth century, and became widely used only under the Tang. In contrast, the *Brahmā's Net*'s Bodhisattva precepts were not that detailed and traditionally had not provided the primary monastic regulations. When the Chinese monk Jianzhen 鑑真 (Jp. Ganjin, 688–763) travelled to Japan, he brought Daoxuan's *Guanzhong chuangli jietan tujing* (關中創立戒壇圖經) with him, and following this text he set up an ordination platform named after the *Prabhūtaratna* pagoda (*duobaota* 多寶塔) with reference to Chapter Eleven of the *Lotus Sūtra* (T 9: 32b -34b). Jianzhen also brought with him the commentaries to the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* by Zhizhou 智周 (678-733) and Faxian 法銑 (718-778). Shortly after his arrival, he established an ordination platform in Nara's Tōdaiji, in front of the great image of Rushana (commonly known as the *Daibutsu* 大仏). Then he conferred the Bodhisattva precepts of the

Brahmā's Net Sūtra on the retired Emperor Shōmu 聖武 (701-756), Empress Kōken 孝謙 (718-770) and over four hundred other people.[193] He then granted the *Sifenlü* ("Vinaya in Four Parts") precepts to over eighty monks, who first renounced the precepts they had taken earlier. After the ordination, one hundred copies of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* were distributed by imperial order. Being invited to perform orthodox ordinations, Jianzhen and his disciples were appointed as officials of the "Office of Monastic Affairs" (*Sōgō* 僧綱) to supervise all ordinations in Japan, and later on the Japanese court implemented a system which had a singular emphasis on the subject of precepts in monks' examinations.[194]

The background of Saichō's monastic education is a continuation of Jianzhen's ordination system. The motivation of building an ordination platform suitable for laymen is the same for Saichō as for the authors of the *Platform Sūtra*. However, Saichō strove to establish his own system of precepts and ordination, arguing for the Bodhisattva precepts. Saichō proposed in his *Shijōshiki* 四条式 that Tendai monks should receive *Brahmā's Net* precepts at the beginning of their twelve-year training; on the other hand, they could receive *Sifenlü* ordination at Tōdaiji after the completion of their training on Mt. Hiei. Saichō called the latter

---

[193] Ōmi no Mifune's *Tōdaioshō tōseiden* 唐大和尚東征伝, annotated text in Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿 (1973), *Ganjin: sono kairitsu shisō* 鑑真—その戒律思想, Tokyo: Daizō shuppansha, p. 317; quoted in Groner (1984: 8).

[194] BZ 125: 15a. Precepts, as well as the *Lotus Sūtra* and the *Golden Light Sūtra* were compulsory. Amongst them, mastery of the precepts is singled out regardless of the subdivisions of Buddhist doctrines which a monk might choose to adopt.

'provisional Hīnayāna ordination' (*keju shōkai* 仮受小戒). Saichō even wished to include esoteric doctrines and rituals in his Bodhisattva precepts, although these did not figure prominently. Just as in the case of Kūkai, the Tendai monks faced criticisms from the Kegon and the Risshū monks. The Risshū monk Buan 豊安 assailed the Tendai school's assertion that the Vinaya also possesses Mahāyāna principles.[195] Buan used the term 'Bodhisattva vinaya master' (*bosatsu risshi* 菩薩律師) to challenge Saichō's assertion that Risshū monks were Hīnayānists. After Saichō's death, his disciples took over the responsibility to debate in favour of a separate system of Tendai ordination. As with Chinese Buddhism, the establishment of the precepts largely relied on reinterpretations of the approach to enlightenment. The Tendai tradition develops the idea that the perfect precepts draw on the perfect nature of enlightenment. As mentioned in connection with Huisi and Zhiyi's strand of thought, attribute-less practice is a key principle in both the "serene and pleasing activities" of the *Lotus Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. This type of attribute-less practice is a demonstration of the perfection of wisdom and is fundamentally in accordance with *śūnyatā*.

During the turn from the late Nara (710-794) to the early Heian period (794-1185), Buddhist consciousness was reinforced by State Buddhism in Japan. For example, the yearly ordinand (*nenbundosha* 年分度者) system, initiated in accordance with Saichō's petition in the twenty-fifth year of the Enryaku era

---

[195] *Kairitsu denraiki* 戒律伝来記 (Record of the Transmission of the Precepts), BZ 64: 146-9.

(806), was meant to ensure the integrity of the position of Tendai monks within the court.[196] However, this is also a proof of the growing sectarian consciousness on Saichō's part. The new Tendai School founded by Saichō drew them away from the six Nara sects whose scholarly traditions had placed less emphasis on actual practices of Buddhism. (Groner 1984: 304) The competition between the Sanron and the Hossō was fierce during the early Heian, and Emperor Kammu 桓武天皇 (737-806, r. 782-806) attempted to balance the two sects by encouraging Buddhist monks to learn Sanron teachings. Saichō's criticism of the six Nara sects can be seen as a response to this competition, as stated in his proposal *Shōnittō shōyakuhyō* 請入唐請益表 to study in Tang China.[197] In the proposal, Saichō first denigrated the *śāstra*-centred Sanron and Hossō, and then he praised the value of the *Lotus Sūtra* as the foundation of the Tendai School.[198] By stating the higher status of sūtras over *śāstras*, the Tendai School was elevated over both Sanron and Hossō. Huisi was particularly appealing to Saichō because of the manner in

---

[196] Cf. Bowring (2005: 62, 98,130); but note that Bowring dates it slightly differently.

[197] *Eizan daishiden* 叡山大師伝, pp. 11-12. According to Sone's analysis of this text in relation to the State Buddhism (2000: 171-184), Saichō was probably the first to claim that these six sects all together represented an old system.

[198] Saichō's views about the Nara sects can be detected in the ten questions for Tang masters, the *Tendaishū miketsu* 天台宗未決 (Problems of the Tendai School, DZ 5: 41-7), which he composed before departing for China. Among the ten questions, the ninth and the tenth questions are about a comparison between Tendai's mind-only and Hossō's consciousness-only doctrines. In addition, Saichō's interest in Kegon was also evident since the eighth question in the *Tendaishū miketsu* is related to the doctrines expounded by Fazang. (DZ 5: 5)

which the former argues against exegetic tradition. Saichō's motivation in emphasising practice is analogical to the anti-scholasticism in sixth century China. These concerns are shown in the teachings of the "threefold learning".

The changes in Saichō's conceptualisation after his encounter with Chinese masters provides a clue to the real scene in China. There are two changes to be mentioned here. First, in the proposal to study in China, he only indicated an interest in the Chinese Tiantai Lotus School. After he came back, however, he realised that expanding his doctrinal scope would bring more advantages to his group. Hence he promoted the study of various "*zong*" within one school.[199] (BZ 125: 13b) Saichō's integrative view was influenced by his Chinese master Daosui. In the precept system which he promoted, the *Lotus Sūtra*'s One-vehicle approach is mobilised as a functional tool to compete with the Esoteric monks. Saichō sees the teaching of the *Lotus Sūtra* as universal and all-inclusive, just as Zhiyi does.

The second thing which Saichō ventured was in connection with the legitimacy of his receiving the transmission. After he returned from China, when he was making great efforts to establish a new Mahāyāna precept platform, the Nara monks characterized Saichō's Chinese transmission as dubious.[200] In order to counter their criticism of a supposedly inauthentic transmission from China, Saichō submitted the *Kenkairon* (顕戒論, "On promoting the Mahāyāna precepts")

---

[199] The word "*zong*" 宗 (Jp. *shū*) is best understood as 'strands of thought' in medieval China. It should be noted that the Chinese use of the term "*zong*" does not necessarily imply any institutional manifestation of a strand of thought. There is a difference in the use of the same word in Japan, however, because Nara state support does imply precisely that.

[200] For the criticisms, see Saichō's *Jō Kenkairon hyō* (上顕戒論表, "A memorial on submitting the *Kenkairon*," DZ 5: 36-38), and Paul Groner (1984: 154).

(DZ 1: 106; T 74, No. 2376: 590c.) to the court in 820. In 821, Saichō (or his later disciples) compiled the *Kenkairon engi* (顕戒論縁起, "Materials concerning the *Kenkairon*")[201] to validate his Chinese masters including Shunxiao 順曉 and Daosui 道邃. Besides adducing the names of Chinese masters for the purpose of strengthening the line of transmission, Saichō also adopted their ideas about Buddhist precepts. Specifically, he learnt the rhetoric of Perfect precepts from his encounter with Daosui, and his ideas about precepts were largely inspired by Dōsen 道璿 (702-760). This can be seen in the *Kenkairon engi*, and for this reason it is an important source for identifying how Saichō's views of precepts are related to his studies in China.

Saichō's precepts adopt the One-vehicle path, the best and the highest path, in relation to the state. In the *Kenkairon*, he writes:

> "If the proposals are approved, then the One-vehicle precepts (一乘佛戒) of the Buddha will not cease (being transmitted) over the years, and the students of the Perfect (Tendai) School will flourish. One hundred

[201] DZ 1: 263-198; BZ 125: 19a-20a. This compilation of works was probably not edited by Saichō himself. Rather, documents forged after his death were added in order to legitimize his esoteric transmission. It seems this work was done later than other sources like *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, *Eizan daishiden*, and *Naishō buppō kechimyakufu*. See Jinhua Chen (1998), "The Construction of Early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism: The Japanese Provenance of Saichō's Transmission Documents and Three Esoteric Buddhist Apocrypha Attributed to Śubhākarasiṃha," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies 21.1* (1998), pp. 21-76, especially p. 26.

> bodhisattva monks will be installed on the mountain. Eight worthies who hold the precepts will pray for rain and easily obtain good results."[202]

The state's patronage was so important that he had to mount a campaign of persuasion regarding the potential benefit to the state. According to this, the spread of the Perfect precepts would help to protect the state (*denkai gokoku* 伝戒護国). Given the value of the *Kenkairon* and the *Kenkairon engi,* the following sections will consult them in detail to bring out the perceptions of Chan and precepts that Saichō inherited from the Chinese masters.

2. Threefold-Learning: Dōsen's Influence on Saichō

Gyōnen 凝然（1240-1321）, in his "Record of the Transmission of the Buddha-dharma through Three Countries" (*Sangoku buppō denzū engi* 三國佛法傳通緣起), when mentioning Saichō's Zen transmission, traces the earliest master in Japan to be the Chinese master Dōsen (702-760), who then transmitted to Gyōhyō 行表 (720-797) and Saichō. (DB467: 20) This Zen transmission line is interesting given the fact that Dōsen was important in transmitting Mahāyāna precepts.[203] In 733, the Japanese emperor Shōmu sent monks to China to seek and

---

[202] *Kenkairon*, DZ 1: 131. Translation from Paul Groner (1984: 176).

[203] Dōsen's (Ch. Daoxuan) name is barely mentioned in the Chinese sources. Only one Chinese catalogue mentions him as a *Vinaya* master based in the Great Fuxian

invite the most suitable *Vinaya* master to Japan. Responding to the imperial invitation, Dōsen arrived in Japan in 736 A.D. Gyōnen's record of the Zen transmission is plausible because Dōsen was connected to Chan circles in China. Dōsen's master was the leading disciple of Shenxiu 神秀 (606?-706): Puji 普寂 (651-739).[204] In accordance with this "Northern Chan" background, Dōsen's teaching of Chan Buddhism regards the *Vinaya* as its fundamental basis. Just like Puji, Dōsen emphasises an equal value for meditation and precepts because they are supposed to be the duties that practitioners should observe diligently. Among various schools of precepts, the "three clusters of pure precepts" (三聚淨戒) discussed in the previous chapter are highlighted in Dōsen's teachings. The doctrinal affiliation of the "Northern Chan" tradition and precepts in Dōsen's teachings is consistent with the doctrinal link between Chan and the Bodhisattva precepts in the Japanese bibliographies.[205]

Monastery in Luoyang. (T 51, No. 2089: 988b). By contrast, more information about him is preserved in the Japanese sources as used here. His biography is restored by Paul Groner (1984: 22-25) based on Kibi no Makibi 吉備真備 (693-775) which is quoted in the *Kechimyakufu* (DZ 1: 211-213) and in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* (DZ 1: 617-18). Also see *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典 4: 3883. Dōsen is contemporary with Du Fei 杜朏, for his relationship with the Tang court under Empress Wu's rule, see Yanagida (1967: 214). He should not be confused with the famous Vinaya master Daoxuan 道宣律師 (596-667), and in this thesis therefore his name is given not in *pinyin* (as Daoxuan) but with the Japanese pronunciation "Dōsen" to avoid any confusion.

[204] For Puji, see Li Yong's 李邕（678-747）*Dazhou chanshi taming* 大照禪師塔銘, *Quan Tang Wen* 262; the *Lengqie shiziji* 楞伽師資記, T85, No. 2837.

[205] It should be recalled that the distinction between the 'Northern' and 'Southern' Chan was not clear cut with regard to practice, but was expressed in dialectical

Dōsen's teaching in Japan bridged the transmission of Buddhist precepts from China. His views on precepts emphasise the balance of the "threefold learning" and they are close to the Tiantai tradition or, more specifically, to Huisi's line of thought. Based in Nara, he was active in giving ordination ceremonies until the arrival of Jianzhen in Japan in 753. After that, Dōsen retired from the capital and moved to Hisodera (比蘇寺) to practise meditation diligently. For all his life, he was an adherent of the principle of an equal emphasis on meditation and precepts, and both Dōsen and Jianzhen were loyal proponents of this combination.[206]

Among his teachings on meditation and precepts, his views on Bodhisattva precepts, found in a commentary on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, influenced Saichō the most.[207] Following Dōsen's commentary, Saichō developed the view that the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* is the most important source of precepts for Mahāyāna Buddhists.[208] According to the surviving quotations of Dōsen's

---

terms. The sudden-gradual dichotomy is in itself questionable because the 'Southern' Chan followers still relied on gradual practice to a large degree.

[206] As discussed in the preceding chapter, this attitude and the interpretation of Chan and precepts as being of equal importance can be found in other Tang Chinese monks as well, including Daoxuan and Zongmi.

[207] Dōsen's influence on Saichō's acquisition of Buddhism can be detected in: 1. Saichō's *Kenkairon* 顕戒論. 2. The Preface to *Ihyō Tendai shū* 依憑天台集. 3. Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* 伝述一心戒文. See Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿 (1986), *Nihon Bukkyō shisō no kenkyū* 日本仏教思想の研究, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, pp.232 – 245.

[208] This view is passed down through Dōsen's "Commentary to the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra"* (梵網經註三卷). This commentary title is mentioned in a Korean catalogue named "*Catalogues of the Lamp Transmission in the Eastern Realm*"

commentary, his teachings of the precepts have a Tiantai basis. Similarly to Dōsen, Tiantai monks in China had developed their views of precepts in accordance with the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* and Huisi's commentary on the *anrakugyō* (Ch. *anlexing* 安樂行, serene and pleasing activities). Both scriptures above emphasise formless practice (無相行), not only for precepts but also for meditation. The term "formless practice" refers to every motion of the practitioner and it manifests the state of mind. Huisi defines the *anrakugyō* as attribute-less practices, so that it in fact affects any of a practitioner's actions. (T46: 700a19) Since it is attribute-less, meditation that arises with the *anrakugyō* requires no fixed posture of meditation. Likewise, the precepts should be observed in accordance with the doctrine of śūnyatā. (T46: 700c5- b18) In Huisi's strand of thought, the formless practice connects the Bodhisattva precepts and meditation in the *Lotus Sūtra.*

Just as with the Chinese Tiantai monks, Saichō's idea of Mahāyāna precepts is based on two sources: the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* and the section on *anrakugyō* in the *Lotus Sūtra.*[209] According to Huisi, the precepts in the *Anrakugyō* of the *Lotus Sūtra* reaffirmed the formless precepts of the *Brahmā's*

(*Dongyu chuandeng mulu* 東域傳燈目錄, T 55, No. 2183: 1155 a-b) and *Youfang jichao* (遊方記抄, T51, No. 2089: 988b) Quotations appear in Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and more in Gyōnen's *Bonmōkai honsho nichijush*ō. For the influence of this commentary on Saichō, see Paul Groner (1984: 24-25).

[209] See his *Kenkairon*, *DZ* 1, also quoted in Groner (1984: 206) Saichō refers to the prohibitions in the *Meaning of the Chapter on Serene and Pleasing Activities in the Lotus Sūtra* to reinforce the similar prohibitions in the *Fanwang jing.* (Groner 1984: 208)

Net Sūtra. Saichō's attitude of adherence to the *Brahmā's Net* precepts conforms to the views of his Chinese masters. Saichō studied Dōsen's commentary on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* at an early stage, and then he followed Mingkuang's teaching that the *Brahmā's Net* precepts are the sole perfect precepts (*enkai* 圓戒).[210] (*Shugo kokkaishō*, DZ 2: 608-30.) This perception of formless practice leads to Saichō's understanding of perfect precepts. By integrating the views above, he terms his precepts "Lotus one-vehicle precepts" (*Hokke ichijōkai* 法華一乗戒) and "Non-action diamond treasure precepts" (*musa kongōhōkai* 無作金剛寶戒).[211] These theories of perfect and formless precepts led to even more abstract theories concerning the approach to enlightenment, in the same way as the *Platform Sutra* developed, as illustrated in Chapter Three.

Saichō's enlightenment theory was influenced by Dōsen's "empty and immobile threefold learning" 虛空不動三學.[212] The line of transmission from

---

[210] In this regard, Mingkuang's attitude differs from Chinese Tiantai founder Zhiyi, who had relegated the *Huayan* and *Brahmā's Net* precepts to a secondary position as a mixture of Unique and Perfect teachings (*betsuenkai*). Traditionally, Tiantai held critical views of Huayan, see Hurvitz, Leon (1962), "Chih-I (538-597): An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk", in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, Publiés par l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, Douzième Volume: 1960-62, Bruxelles, Juillet 1962, pp. 231-32; 245-6; 262-7.

[211] The basis of formless precepts is reflected in his perception of Chan Buddhism, which will be explained in the discussion about *endon zenkai*.

[212] See the citations of Dōsen's teachings in Saichō's *Kechifumyaku*.

Shenxiu is featured by the syncretic learning centred at the Yuquan Monastery 玉泉寺, well-known for its reputation in various Buddhist traditions, notably Esoteric Buddhism, Tiantai, Huayan and Chan teachings, all taken together. This is why the elements of Tiantai, Huayan, Vinaya and Chan are cited extensively in Dōsen's writings. This approach is reflected in Saichō's interest in Tiantai, Huayan and meditation. On the other hand, the disputations initiated by Shenhui 神會 (684-760) in China had influenced Dōsen's teachings.[213] Shenhui accused Puji's 'observing the mind' of being a burden for everyone's *bodhicitta*, and proposed that discerning the intrinsic essence is a better approach.[214] Shenhui's simpler approach proved popular among the literati and emperors. The claimed sudden enlightenment became an ideology of its own. In response to Shenhui's accusation, Dōsen adopted the gradual practice and contrived the "empty and immobile threefold learning". In other words, Dōsen's doctrinal swing corresponds with the tendency of simplification in China proper. In this respect, Dōsen's teaching is an extension of Chinese Buddhism in eighth century Japan, and attracted Japanese followers and patrons in preaching the path to enlightenment. His advocacy of the threefold learning, with an emphasis on the coalition of meditation and precepts, is consistent with the Northern Chan tradition, and it directs us to the influence of Huisi's ideas of formless practice.

---

[213] See his "*Puti Damo nanzong ding shifelun*" 菩提達摩南宗定是非論, in "*Shenhui hoshang yiji*" 神會和尚遺集, pp. 281-90, Taipei: Hu Shi jinianguan，1970.

[214] Puji's instruction may be summarized as "凝心入定, 住心看淨, 起心外照, 攝心內證".

3. Daosui and Saichō's *Kenkairon engi*

According to the *Kenkairon engi*, Saichō took studies under Tiantai Master Daosui 道邃 (fl. 796-805) in the Longxing Temple (龍興寺) of Taizhou (Jp. Taishū 台州). (DZ 1: 273-275) Daosui is said to have given lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*, meditation and Buddhist precepts in the Longxing Temple at the request of local officials. He was particularly good at explaining the "perfect and sudden teachings" of Tiantai Buddhism. On the other hand, since Daosui cannot be found in any important sources in China, he was probably not a particularly prominent master in Chinese literati circles. He was referred to as the "Master Daosui who transmitted Bodhisattva precepts" (傳菩薩戒道邃和上). (DZ1: 273) Among the Tiantai teachings which Daosui taught Saichō, the Bodhisattva precepts eventually played the most important role partly because of the domestic situation of Japanese Buddhism. The debates about precepts took place in Nara as mentioned earlier, so the reformation of the ordination platform was still an ongoing process in Japan. However, it was not until Saichō encountered denunciation in Japan that he had to re-emphasise the legitimacy of the Bodhisattva precepts which he received from Daosui. The Perfect Bodhisattva precepts built upon the authority of Daosui were proclaimed in the *Kenkairon engi* in 821 A.D., the next year after the appearance of the *Kenkairon.* Due to vicious competition and criticisms from Esoteric Buddhists, the institution which Saichō established in 805 A.D. was about to vanish. He had to unite once again all the important teachings of the Tendai School: the bodhisattva path, meditation,

and the perfect precepts (*enkai* 圓戒) which are mainly based on the three clusters of pure precepts (*Sanju jōkai* 三聚淨戒) in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. The doctrines of perfect and pure precepts came mainly from Daosui's teachings in Taizhou, which are in accordance with Zhiyi's teachings (see Chapter Three). In the case of Saichō, the functional aspect of the Bodhisattva precepts in building a Mahāyāna precept platform in Japan cannot be overemphasised. This is similar to how Chinese masters Jianzhen and Daoxuan took pains in establishing ordination platform. (See Chapter Three.)

First Saichō mentions Daosui in the *Kenkairon* and the *Taishūroku* (台州録). In both texts, Saichō refers to Daosui as "Master Daosui of the Western Capital, the Abbot of the Perfect Teachings on Mount Tiantai in the Great Tang" (*Daitō Tendaisan enshū zasu seikyō Oshō Dōzui* 大唐天臺山圓宗座主西京和尚道邃, T 55: 1058a3.) and "Tiantai Master Daosui" (*Tendai Dōzui Oshō* 天臺道邃和尚, T 74: 590c8.). In the preface to his bibliographies, he emphasised the legitimacy of his master Daosui. This emphasis is understandable since Saichō's bibliographies were made to convince the emperor of the value of his study in China. The title of "Tiantai monk", however, is still quite a modest one. It is possible that it was used because Saichō himself was not so confident of Daosui's fame in Tiantai circles in China. By contrast, Daosui's status levelled up as the "seventh generation disciple after Zhiyi" (*Chishadaishi daishichi deshi* 智者大師第七弟子, DZ 1: 573; T74: 643c15-25) as mentioned in the court certificate

collected in Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkaimon.*[215] He is also referred as "the seventh patriarch Daosui" in the *Kenkairon engi* (DZ1: 275), which was much more respectful than simply "Tiantai Monk".

The political implications of Daosui's activities indicate a multicultural setting in Taizhou. The situation in Taizhou provides important information about the religious-political background of Sino-Japan relations. With increasing cultural interation between China and Japan, the court spent more attention on China's south-eastern region. Given the usual careful control of immigrants, foreign monks in China may have received special attention from an officialdom which was itself confronted with ethnic tensions in the south-eastern region. On the other hand, it often happened that the regional government was in favour of imparting Chinese culture to foreigners, and Chinese Buddhism was presented as part of Chinese culture so as to build amiable relations rather than hostility. Given that Buddhist monasteries played an important role in the Confucianisation which was part of the process of Chinese cultural colonisation in southern China, the exporting of Chinese culture could easily be carried out in monasteries where regional elites and monks gathered for discussions and Buddhist activites.

Daosui's contact with Saichō also took place against a general background of this kind. Daosui had good relationships with two local officials in Taizhou, namely Zheng Shenze 鄭審則 (or Lu Shenze 盧審則, d.u.) and Pei Su

---

[215] Jinhua Chen argues that this title for Daosui was forged by Kōjō to glorify Saichō's Chinese masters: Shunxiao and Daosui. It is suspicious because of the discrepancy in the manner of referring to Daosui. (Chen 1998: 32-33)

裴肅 (fl. 798).[216] His career as a Dharma preacher was characterized by official support and interaction with Japanese monks. The recognition by regional officialdom which Daosui received, was also marked by some sort of ethnic tension as just mentioned.[217] However, being located at an important port, Daosui's monastery in Taizhou was also able to be a cultural outpost of the Buddhist exchange between Chinese and Japanese monks.[218] Read in this light, the support of Tang officials towards Daosui was in this sense a deliberate act of policy on the basis of Chinese sense of legitimacy.[219] Daosui and the officials were loyal servants to the court when receiving foreign monks. Even though we cannot precisely know their own intentions, the Buddhist teaching and learning of Buddhist monks were in this case secondary to the political considerations. The

[216] For Saichō's mention of Zheng Shenze as an official in Mingzhou 明州, see DZ 1: 280-281.

[217] (貞元二十年台州刺史, 請下龍興, 講法華止觀。至今年二月, 因勾當本國教門, 且暫停耳。但乾淑隨和上, 始得十年, 在前之事, 悉不具知, 略書而已。) (DZ1: 274) This passage in "The Portrayal of Monk Daosui" (道邃和上行跡大唐天台沙門乾淑述), which was orally given by Chinese monk Qianshu 乾淑 and collected in the *Kenkairon engi*, provides such information. According to this, he was supported by local officials in the twentieth year of the Zhenyuan era (804 A.D.), but was later suppressed by the officials. The suspension of his lecturing was due to the activities he engaged in with Japanese monks.

[218] See p. 35 of Hisayuki Miyakawa (1960), "The Confucianization of South China", in Arthur F. Wright, ed., *The Confucian Persuasion*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 21-46.

[219] Daosui is a case study for the interaction between local officials and Buddhist monks in southern China of this time. For the specific historical circumstances in relation to foreign monks, see T. H. Barrett, "Cutting wood and giving gifts: life on the frontier c. 800", unpublished manuscript.

ideological acts of Chinese central and local government officials may be better regarded as part of the enactment of policy towards foreign Buddhist monks.

When Saichō first arrived at Taizhou in 804 A.D., the region was constantly in a state of warfare between the Chinese and non-Han groups. Thus during Saichō's stay in Taizhou he witnessed the subtle religious-political interactions among ethnic groups. Being himself an object of the religious policy of southern Chinese officials, Saichō's stay in China influenced his perception of Buddhist precepts in relation to the court politics.

This multi-cultural and ethnic contact through Buddhism stimulated the cultural identities of Buddhist monks. As mentioned in the previous chapters, first in China and then in Japan, from the seventh century Buddhists became acutely conscious of their country's marginal position and of being far from the time of the historical Buddha.[220] Same as the Chinese case, the Japan-centred discourse attempts to overcome the temporal and spatial separation from the Buddha by portraying Buddhism as flourishing in Japan.[221] Saichō writes that, "The provisional teachings have already drawn to a close and set in the west. The sun of

---

[220] As the recurring phrase "a peripheral land in the latter age" (*masse hendo*) expresses. Jacqueline I. Stone (2009), "Realizing This World as the Buddhaland", in *Readings of the Lotus Sūtra*, eds., Stephen F. Teiser and Jacqueline I. Stone. New York; Chichester : Columbia University Press, pp. 209-236, quoted from p. 219.

[221] A survey of this type of claims is found in Mark L. Blum (2006), "The *Sangoku-Mappō* Construct: Buddhism, Nationalism, and History in Medieval Japan," in *Discourse and Ideology in Medieval Japanese Buddhism*, eds., Richard K. Payne and Taigen Dan Leighton, London; New York: Routledge, pp. 31-51.

the true teaching will now rise over the eastern land."[222] Buddhism will move to the east where the sun rises. Through the symbolic association with the sun, the eastern land becomes an effulgent land for the time of the latter Dharma. The symbolism of the sun is linked with the shape of the lotus flower, as mentioned earlier. For this reason, the potency attributed to the *Lotus Sūtra* is enhanced and it can serve to protect the state of Japan. The Japanese monks' concern about being at the Buddhist periphery, which conflicted with sense of legitimacy, is a consistent theme in the Tendai tradition.

The Buddhist worldview was therefore taken to overlap national borders in a geographical sense. Developing from Saichō, Annen drew on the legacy of imperial patronage associated with the Bodhisattva precepts, following examples such as Zhiyi and Jianzhen. He divided the "sphere of practice" (Ch. *Daochang*, Jp. *dōjō* 道場) into two types: the inner and the outer. (T74: 760b) The inner sphere is one's mind. The outer sphere, according to the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* and the *Qihuan tujing*, is where the bodhisattvas receive and maintain the precepts. So the "sphere of practice" is the whole state, which becomes a blessed land when the emperors give their support. (T 74: 760c8)

4. "Perfect and Sudden Precepts" (*Endonkai*)

All the learning from Dōsen, Jianzhen, Daoxin and Daosui was integrated into Saichō's synthesis of the precepts. The *endonkai*, a combination of Bodhisattva precepts and 'perfection and suddenness', reflects new interpretations of the existent Bodhisattva precepts. Before Saichō went to China, he had learnt

[222] *Shugo kokkai shō* 守護国界章, DDZ 2: 234. Cf. Stone (2009: 220).

the Bodhisattva precepts of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* and some scriptures brought to Japan by Jianzhen and Dōsen. After his journey in China, the content of Saichō's Buddhist teachings had changed: he incorporated four Chinese lineages including Tiantai, Esoteric, Chan and Precepts (*endon zenkai* **圓密禪戒**). He also incorporated Dōsen's teachings of emptiness and "threefold learning" for these precepts.

The "threefold learning" precepts have been overlooked, because Japanese scholars have regarded Saichō and Kōjō's written works as historically and doctrinally deficient. As Bodiford (2005:188) observes, "previous scholars have examined neither the role that Tendai interpretations of precepts and ordination rituals has played in Zen practice nor the ways in which Japanese monks blended together ideas based on Tendai, Zen, and Esoteric Buddhism to interpret precepts in ways that transcend commonplace notions of sectarian identity." In fact, Saichō's view of precepts was a foundation of the Buddha-nature theory in Japanese Tendai tradition. From Saichō onwards, Japanese Buddhists began to distinguish between the conventional wording of precepts (*jikai* **事戒**) and ideal precepts (*rikai* **理戒**) regarding the Buddha-nature. This interpretation was connected tightly to Zen Buddhism because of the "threefold learning" which links meditation and precepts.[223] The explanation of Buddha-nature provides a theoretical ground for meditation in relation to enlightenment.

[223] The concept of "*zenkai*" (Zen precepts) became prominent later in the Sōtō Zen (曹洞禪) lineage, in which the ordination rituals rest on the doctrine that the wordless awakening of the patriarchs is conveyed through these Zen precepts. It is also claimed that the Zen precepts were brought to Japan by Bodhidharma. See

The notion of perfect teaching was well known in China, and Saichō had also taken it up to connect the perfect faculties (*enki* 円機) and the sudden faculties (*tonki* 頓機). The faculties for enlightenment are equated with the potential to achieve Buddhahood. For the Buddhists in China and Japan, it was a pertinent question as to how human body in this life could become buddha. To attain Buddhahood in this life (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成仏) is one of the distinctive features of early Nara Buddhism. In the "Explanation of the elegant phrases in the *Lotus Sūtra"* (*Hokke shūku* 法華秀句), Saichō proposes his ideal monastic practice based on the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, proclaiming that his disciples could be trained to realise enlightenment during their current lifetime (*sokushin jōbutsu*). (DZ 3: 111-240)

Zhiyi's perfect precepts mean "perfect and round Bodhisattva precepts" (*Yuanrong pusajie* 圓融菩薩戒).[224] One-vehicle precepts of this type incorporated meditation and wisdom with the implication of a bodhisattva's attainment of wisdom and compassion. The perfect precepts that Saichō learned from Daosui belong to this teaching as advanced by Zhiyi. Daosui's teachings were the major source of Saichō's understanding of the perfect precepts. Saichō's *Kenkairon* covers an exceedingly broad scope and the diverse terminology of precepts makes

---

Bodiford (2005:187), and his reference to Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆 (1961), "Zenkai shisō no tenkai", in *Dōgen zenshi to sono monryū* 道元禪師とその門流, Tokyo: Seishin Shobō, pp. 149-173, (reprinted from 1939).

[224] As explained in Mingkuang's "Commnentary on Tiantai Bodhisattva Precepts" (*Tiantai pusajie shu*,天臺菩薩戒述). (T 40: 584 ab.)

it a complex piece to read. Nevertheless its synthesising and comprehensive characteristics correspond to the principle of "round and perfect" precepts brought up by Zhiyi.[225] These "perfect and round precepts" are meant to integrate the "threefold learning". As everyone possesses Buddha-nature inherently, the observance of precepts supposedly results in a mastery of meditation and wisdom. The precepts are the first step in the preparation to become an unhindered practitioner. This theory was later rephrased as "threefold learning as a whole" (*sangaku ittai* 三学一体).[226] The "threefold learning" is the underlying theme of Saichō's *Kenkairon* and it defends the system of practice that he devised for the Tendai monks. Because of the necessity of the link between the practice of meditation and precepts, they are called "Precepts, Meditation and Wisdom of the Perfect and Sudden [Teaching]" (*endon kai-jō-e* 圓頓戒定慧) in Saichō's terminology. (DZ 1: 150)

In sum, the emphasis on the potential of achieving enlightenment by means of the precepts alone developed in the ninth century. As an outcome of this transformation of the meaning of precept conferral, the Bodhisattva precepts led into the idea of all-embracing Buddha nature. Thus the goal of an ordination ceremony is the confirmation of the Buddha nature. These precepts embody "enlightenment in one's own present body" (Ch. *Jishen chengfo*, Jp. *sokushin*

---

[225] Ishida Mizumaro (1986), pp. 150 – 153.

[226] DZ 1: 580, 636, 618. DZ 3: 583. Also see Fukuda Gyōei, *Tendaigaku gairon*, pp. 615-25.

jōbutsu 即身成仏).[227] In so doing, the precepts override the distinction between Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, because they are the vehicle of salvation (Ch. *Jiesheng yizhi*, Jp. *kaijō itchi* 戒乗一致).[228] It is in this way that Saichō's idea of precepts attempts to unify the Mahāyāna and the "threefold learning", and this approach of combining Chan and precepts was identical with that of his Chinese masters.

5. Daoxin's Influence on Saichō: the Lineage of Bodhidharma

The Bodhidharma lineage was solidified during Daoxin's 道信 (580-651) time, after this Indian patriarch's connection with Bodhisattva precepts and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* had been invented in the meantime. The seventh century is therefore important for the establishment of the lineage of Bodhidharma. The intellectual context for the rise of Chan Buddhism in the late seventh century, as Jinhua Chen has shown, is linked to the competitions between Chan schools.[229] He argues that judging from Daoxuan's *Xichanlun* there was a rivalry between Bodhidharma and the followers of Sengchou.[230] The evidence suggests, however,

---

[227] For this concept in relation to Buddha-nature in the Japanese context, see Groner (1990: 266-268)

[228] William M. Bodiford (2005), "Bodhidharma's precepts in Japan", in *Going Forth: visions of Buddhist vinaya*, ed. by William M. Bodiford**,** Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005, pp. 185 - 209. P. 187.

[229] Jinhua Chen (2002b), *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship*. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, pp. 231–232.

[230] Daoxuan, usually thought of as a *vinaya* master (*lushi* 律師), also had a life-long interest in *chan* practice. In reading the *Xichan lun,* Chen observed that with

that the notion of a special lineage of transmission from Bodhidharma is unlikely to have come into existence before Hongren's disciples appeared in the capitals in the late seventh century. (Greene, 2008: 103)

How should we assess the insertion of Bodhidharma in the lineage of Daoxin's community? The first point to note is that Daoxin's method of practices, noticeably closer to Daoism, exhibits differences from Bodhidharma's ascetic, hermit path.[231] His establishment of Buddha-images and a monastery amounted to an advocation of Buddhist institutionalisation, and his writing on the precepts shows his concern with revising monastic regulations. (Chappell, 1983: 90) The way he unites the traditions of Pure Land, Mādhyamika and Yogācāra is a typical procedure in Chinese syncretism. (Chappell: 1983: 98) However, regarding these characteristics, Daoxin is rather different from Bodhidharma. The question arises therefore as to why Bodhidharma was added to the lineage of Daoxin. According to Daoxuan's "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" (*Xu gaosengzhuan*), it seems that there were no direct relations between them, and the lineage was built upon textual connections through the "Treatise on Two Entries and Four

---

the exception of the followers of Bodhidharma, representatives of all the "groups" of meditation practitioners that Daoxuan mentions were invited to reside at temples. Jinhua Chen (2002a), 'An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China: Meditation in the Life and Works of Dauxuan (596-667)', *T'oung Pao* 88.4-5, pp. 332-395. pp. 366–367. Greene argues that the opponent in Daoxuan's writing was Xinxing instead, see Eric Greene, (2008), "Another Look at Early *Chan*: Daoxuan, Bodhidharma, and the Three Levels Movement", in *T'oung Pao* 94, No. 1-3, (2008), pp. 49-114.

[231] For Daoxin's thought, see David W. Chappell (1983), "The Teachings of the Fourth Ch'an Patrairch Tao-hsin (580-651)," in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, Lewis Lancaster and Whalen Lai, eds., Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983. Also partly treated in Yanagida (1985: 157).

Practices" (*Erru sixing lun*) and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, which were said to have been transmitted by Bodhidharma. As Chappell (1983: 100) suggests, "there is a progression of common themes from Bodhidharma to Tao-hsin which lends support to the classic Ch'an lineage which we find articulated for the first time by the disciples of Hung-jen." The invented link to Bodhidharma became a central theme to Hongren's (602-675) disciples. It seems the textual connection was a driving force for creating a lineage. Another textual connection is Daoxin's "Manual of Rules of Bodhisattva Precepts" (*Pusa jiefa* 菩薩戒法) mentioned in the "Chronicle of the Sources of *Laṅkā* Masters" (*Lengqie shiziji*) which is the earliest mention of Bodhisattva precepts in the Chan tradition. Even though Bodhidharma was not said to have written any texts about the Bodhisattva precepts, Daoxin's "Manual of Rules of Bodhisattva Precepts" turned Bodhidharma into a representative of these precepts, as the following section will explain. The insertion of Bodhidharma in the Chan lineage implies a breakthrough during Daoxin's time. As a result of this, Daoxin's teachings on meditation and precepts were connected to the conceptual coalition of Bodhidharma and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. This conceptual coalition, the main theme of Chapter Two, lies in the promotion by both of the value of real practice, as going against scholasticism.

So it seems that Bodhidharma exists in the lineage mainly as an important Indian name, and the actual teachings on meditation have another indigenous origin. Dōsen, Daoxin and Saichō's perceptions of Chan demonstrate Huisi's influence on the Chan School. In fact, it is quite likely that Huisi's "Chan" was the origin of the "Chan School", which could be also called "Bodhidharma's

strand of thought" 達摩系, i.e. "the Chan of the Bodhidharma succession". (Yanagida, 1967: 448) According to Yanagida (1967: 437- 445), the link between Bodhidharma and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* was fabricated by later Buddhists; in fact, what was crucial was the *prajñā* thought that constantly appears in Bodhidharma's "Treatise on Two Entries and Four Practices". Since Huisi's master Huiwen was also a master of Mādhyamika, Huisi and Bodhidharma were of a similar doctrinal pedigree. Huisi's idea of 'free consciousness samādhi' conforms to the ideas in two other scriptures translated by Kumārajiva (344 - 413): the "Sūtra of Secret and Key Guidance for Meditation" (*Chanmi yaofa jing* 禪秘要法經, T 15, No. 613) and the "Sūtra of Seated Meditation Samādhi" (*Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經, T 15, No. 614). Looked at from this aspect, Huisi's thought concerning meditation and "the Chan of the Bodhidharma succession" had the same origin. In this regard, the images of Bodhidharma and Huisi had rather similar functions as well as being complementary to each other.

Tiantai and Chan monks shared the same resources in learning meditation, and in this sense, the later Chan lineage was simply 'a' lineage among several similar systems of Dharma transmission. Zhiyi's organisation of the four kinds of samādhi represents an attempt to classify all teachings on meditation, just as Zongmi did later in his "Summarizing Preface to the Collection of Chan

Sources" (*Chanyuan zhuquanji duxu* 禅源諸詮集都序).[232] It should be noted, however, that neither Zhiyi nor Huisi mentioned a lineage of the meditation tradition of their own. Probably this is because lineage construction was an issue in later periods and, during this early stage, they still freely referred to and incorporated many other meditation systems for the sake of systematizing Buddhist teachings of similar kinds. The four kinds of samādhi contain holistic and eclectic teachings on meditation, and this grouping widely influenced other schools' meditation teachings, whether among the Chan, Esoteric or Pure Land traditions.

A perceived need for systematization and classification implies that teachings on meditation were not yet united. This further indicates that, in early stages, Chan-related terminology was often borrowed and shared by various schools. Judging from Saichō's usage of "*Chan zong*", the word "*Chan*" was initially designed for the Tiantai School more than for the '*Chan* School'. (Magnin, 1979: 122) It is probably more appropriate to call the early Chan School "*Damo zong*" 達摩宗 as implied above. This is because the teachings of meditation were developed first by Huisi and Zhiyi, and most of the early Chan masters seemed to be influenced by the two Tiantai patriarchs. Hence, there was a period when the terminology was used loosely by both schools. The freely borrowed ideas and language correspond to Daoxin's syncretistic approach in doctrinal formulation. The strategy and method used by Daoxin were taken up by

[232] T 48, No 2015. For a study and translation of this text, see Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄 (1971), trans., *Zengen shosenshū tojo* 禅源諸詮集都序, Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

Saichō and his disciples, as the following section will discuss. The necessity of lineage for precept conferral has a long tradition in China proper, as Chapter Two illustrated. So lineage is a crucial criterion for the survival of transmission. On the other hand, the fact that the figure of Bodhidharma cannot be replaced by Huisi seems simply to be a response to concerns that an Indian patriarch is needed.

6. Bodhidharma in the Lineage Accounts

A) Saichō's *Naishō Buppō Sōjō Kechimyakufu*

The manuals of Bodhisattva precept conferral, to our surprise, played a central role in preserving Chan lineages in Japan. The Chinese manuals of precept conferral, connected to lineage conferral, became the underlying narrative in Saichō's and Annen's works. These materials provide information crucial to differentiating the lineages while avoiding the terminological problem regarding the meditation traditions. This section examines Saichō, Kōjō and Annen's statements about the lineage of Bodhidharma.

The *Naishō Buppō Sōjō Kechimyakufu* (内証仏法相承血脈譜, "A diagrammatic description of the secretly certified blood-lineages of the Dharma") collects five lineages that Saichō received in China, including those of Bodhidharma, Tendai, Bodhisattva precepts and Esoteric teachings.[233] The

[233] DZ 1: 200-215. (達磨大師付法相承師師血脈譜一首。天台法華宗相承師師血脈譜一首。 天台圓教菩薩戒相承師師脈脈譜一首。胎藏金剛兩曼荼羅相承師師血脈譜一首。雜曼荼羅相承師師血脈譜一首。) However, Jinhua Chen (1998) has argued that this text was considerably altered and parts were added

lineages presented there provided a clue to the differentiation between various traditions in China. Relevant here are three lineages: those relating to Bodhidharma, the Tendai and the Bodhisattva precepts. The Bodhidharma Zen lineage (*Darumazen kechimyakufu* 達磨禪血脈譜) includes Hongren, Shenxiu, Puji, Gyōhyō and Saichō. Although not counted as a patriarch, Dōsen is mentioned particularly for his commentary on the Bodhisattva precepts in this section.

By contrast, the Tendai Lotus lineage (*Hokkeshū kechimyakufu* 法華宗血脈譜) seems to rely on Mādhyamika, which includes patriarchs such as Kumārajīva and others that are adapted from the *Mohezhiguan*. The perfection of wisdom is emphasised with the mention of *Dazhidu lun* 大智度論, Nāgārjuna and Kumārajīva. In this lineage, the transmission from the Buddha to Mahākāśyapa is explained in detail, and it quotes the "Account of the Transmission of the Dharmapitaka" (Ch. *Fufazang yinyuan zhuan* 付法藏因緣傳) a considerable number of times. Interestingly, the third lineage in Saichō's *Kechimyakufu*, the Bodhisattva precepts lineage (*Bosatsukai kechimyakufu* 菩薩戒血脈譜), is similar to the line of patriarchs in the "Account of the Transmission of the Dharmapitaka." The latter then adds after the Indian patriarchs Kumārajīva, Huisi, Zhiyi, Daosui, Saichō and finally Gishin. The reasons for including each of the above are not difficult to fathom. Kumārajīva is there because he translated the most important part of the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* into Chinese. Huisi, Zhiyi and

after Saichō's death. For this reason, we can only take the opinions in this text as reflecting the ninth century right after Saichō's death.

Daosui are included to provide the Tiantai connection, and what they transmitted to Saichō is the "perfect and round Bodhisattva precepts".

Therefore, each patriarch has his function and symbolic meaning in these lineages. Huisi represents the authority of the Bodhisattva precepts lineage and Bodhidharma represents the meditation lineage. They are two complementary figures for the legacy that Saichō and his disciples needed. The way Bodhidharma was incorporated in the lineages shows similarities between Daoxin's disciples and Saichō's. The most divergent feature of the two lineages is that, in the Bodhisattva precepts lineage, the highest authority comes from Vairocana in the World of Lotus Platform Treasure (蓮華臺藏世界) as recorded in the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*. The overall differentiation leads to the conclusion that the legacy of the three lineages is built on Bodhidharma, Mādhyamika thought, and the Buddha Vairocana respectively.

B) Bodhidharma in Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*

The Tendai connection with Bodhidharma was largely advocated by Kōjō 光定 (779-858) in the essay called *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* 伝述一心戒文 (written in 834). The bulk of this text aims to support Saichō's campaign to win government authorization for exclusive Tendai ordinations based on the Mahāyāna precepts.[234] Kōjō's invention lies in the way in which he incorporated

[234] Such a political motive is identifiable when, for example in the third fascicle of this scripture, it says "the One Vehicle Precept is the first sign of good fortune." (T 74: 651c; Bodiford, 2005: 189)

Bodhidharma into the lineage, which is influential.[235] He narrates the lineage as following:

> Vairocana Buddha –
> Sakyamuni Buddha –
> The twenty-eight Zen patriarchs in India –
> Bodhidharma –
> Huisi (515-577) –
> Zhiyi (538-597) —
> Saichō

This lineage differs from the *Kechimyakufu*, which does not combine Chan and Tiantai patriarchs within a single lineage. Until Saichō's death, his petition to build a Tendai order with the reformed precepts did not bring any effect. His request was rejected partially because there was no Buddhist monk who had ever been ordained by the bodhisattva precepts alone (Groner, 1984: 146-8). Bodhidharma has been regarded as the model of a bodhisattva monk (*bosatsusō* 菩薩僧), therefore he is an important figure needed by the Tendai sect. (T74: 642b) Through the concept of 'empty-space' (*kokū* 虚空), Bodhidharma is linked to Vairocana Buddha, who bestowed on the Tendai sect the 'empty-space immovable precepts' (*kokū fudō kai* 虚空不動戒), the 'empty-space immovable meditation' (*kokū fudō jō* 虚空不動定), and the 'empty-space immovable wisdom' (*kokū fudō e* 虚空不動慧). (T74: 653a – 656a; Bodiford, 2005: 194) This interpretation takes Vairocana Buddha and Bodhidharma's transmission as the single authority for the 'Bodhisattva Chan precepts'.

---

[235] This inclusion of Bodhidharma in the Tendai tradition persisted until the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. When the Japanese Zen group started to detach from the Tendai tradition, they began to claim that their legacy of Bodhidharma possessed a direct link to enlightenment. William Bodiford (2005) observed that Zen and Tendai shared the same doctrinal basis in interpreting the precepts and ordination rituals.

C) Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*

Annen's (841-889-?) "commentary on the conferral of Bodhisattva precepts" (*Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒儀廣釋, written in 882)[236] attests the authority of precept conferral through the textual sources of the manuals regarding it.[237] (T 74: 757b) Annen's narrative of the lineage for precept conferral is different from that of Kōjō. (T74: 761b) According to him the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* was first passed down from Rushana Buddha to over twenty Indian patriarchs before being introduced to China. In China, Kumārajīva first transmitted it to Huisi, who was followed by eight Tiantai patriarchs. Unlike Kōjō, Annen did not include Bodhidharma, but followed the Bodhisattva precept lineage in the *Kechimyakufu*. Despite this emphasis on lineage, precept conferral can also be conducted in front of Buddhist Sūtras or Buddhist statues without any masters, which is consistent with the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*.

Bodhidharma, although not included in the lineage, has crucial textual authority according to the *Futsū ju bosatsukaigi kōshaku*. There are ten texts listed by Annen, among which the seventh is called the *Bodhidharma Edition* (*Damo*

---

[236] T 74, No, 2381. For a detailed study of this doctrine and its political implications, see Paul Groner (1990), 'The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku'*, in Robert Buswell, ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 251-290.

[237] Groner (1990: 256) sees the reinterpretations by Annen as a device to facilitate Saichō's construction of the Bodhisattva ordination platform: Annen reinterpreted it because Chinese and Japanese aristocracy and rulers did not like to observe the precepts they found inconvenient.

ben 達摩本). Interestingly enough, this scripture has an indirect connection with the Tiantai Patriarch Huisi in the Japanese bibliographies and Annen's commentary. Huisi's "Manual for Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral " (*Shou pusajie yi* 授菩薩戒儀, X 105:1-5) was absorbed by the Northern Chan School, and the *Nanyue Edition* (*Nanyue ben* 南岳本) is first mentioned in Saichō's *Taishūroku* with a line indicating "spoken by Nanyue Huisi" (受菩薩戒文一卷, 南岳思大師說, T 55: 1056c10).[238] Ennin's catalogues, however, list the "Passage for Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral" (*Shou pusa jiewen* 受菩薩戒文) in one fascicle without specifying the edition, whether that of Huisi or Bodhidharma or Daoxin. (T 55: 1075b14, 1077c14, 1086c5) Enchin's mentioning the text titled "Precept Conferral, Chan Blood-lineage and Others" (*Shoujie ji Chan xiemai zhuan deng* 受戒及禪血脈傳等) in his catalogue (T 55: 1107b) shows a perception of the connection between the Bodhisattva precepts and Chan lineage. Nevertheless, among the above mentioned, only Saichō's catalogue names the author, and it seems there was no fixed authorship for the manuals of precept conferral. Hence, an attempt to classify the manuals was made by Annen. According to his commentary (T 74: 757b), the "Manual for Bodhisattva Precepts Conferral " (Jp. *Ju bosatsukaigi*, Ch. *Shou pusa jieyi* 受菩薩戒儀) had several variant editions,

[238] For the contents of the the *Nanyue ben* (*Eishi bon* 慧思本 in the article) compared to other manuals of Bodhisattva precepts, see Tsuchihashi Shūkō 土橋秀高 (1960), "Tonkōbon jubosatsukaigi kō" 敦煌本受菩薩戒儀考，*Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 15 (1960), 8-1, pp. 33-42, especially pp. 36-8. As to its authenticity, some Japanese scholars have doubted the authorship of Huisi; see Taira Ryōshō 平了照 (1955), "Eshibon—*Ju bosatsukai bun*—ni tsuite" 慧思本受菩薩戒文について, in *Taishō daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 40 (1955), pp. 1-36. Tonegawa Hiroyuki (*Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, 27.2) argues that Huisi's edition is in fact later than Zhanran's edition.

including the *Bodhidharma Edition*, which was said to be compiled from a lecture by Bodhidharma. (Magnin 1979: 117-123) Annen's explanation was meant to provide a solution regarding the authorship, but it is not certain whether it was a reliable record or his own invention.

However, the authenticity of this *Bodhidharma Edition* has been questioned by scholars. Sekiguchi argues that this edition is identical with the *Nanyue edition*, and that the attribution to Bodhidharma was deliberately done by Annen in order to remove the name of the *Nanyue Edition*.[239] Both scriptures need further clarification for either of them seems to be attributed to Huisi or Bodhidharma. The newly inserted Bodhidharma edition, according to Sekiguchi (1961: 467) might mean "the Bodhisattva precepts belonging to the Bodhidharma School", if taken literally. This gives accidental proof of the popularity of the Bodhisattva precepts of Daoxin's group, which may be categorised as the "Bodhidharma School" for a certain time in the seventh century. The similarity between the survival of Huisi's Bodhisattva precepts and the "*Mahāyāna Gate to the Skilful Means of Non-Birth*" *(Dasheng wusheng fangbian men* 大乘無生方便門*)* (T 85, no. 2834) suggests the doctrinal affiliation between Northern Chan School and Huisi. (Sekiguchi, 1961: 468-9) These manuals with similar contents for precept conferral demonstrate at least a shared faith orientation among Huisi's and Daoxin's followers. Taken together, it is very likely that the *Nanyue ben* and *Damo ben* was the same thing. (Sekiguchi, 1967: 297-305) Whether as a deliberate

239 Sekiguchi Shindai (1961) "Jubosatsukaigi darumabon ni tsuite" 授菩薩戒儀達磨本について, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 9-2 (1961), pp. 465-470, especially p. 470.

replacement or not, it indicates that Huisi was in some way interchangeable with Bodhidharma.[240] The replacing of the title implies an attempt to create a contextual association, rather than a doctrinal one, between Chan lineages and the Bodhisattva precepts.

These pieces of information about Chan lineage were preserved in the Japanese sources concerning the procedure of Bodhisattva precepts conferral. (DZ 1: 308, 320; DZ 2: 202-3) Enchin and Annen also mentioned the Chan lineage based on Saichō's claim in the special texts about Bodhisattva Precepts conferral.[241] The Japanese monks seem to present a quite straightforward view of the lineage associated with the Bodhisattva precepts, but it was not a mere Japanese invention since it was also consistent with the Chinese understanding of these matters.

The reason why it was Bodhidharma but not Huisi who figures in the lineage brings our attention back to the formation of the standard patriarchal image. An Indian and mysterious figure is needed for the Chinese mentality of being distant from the Buddha. This was a more effective solution for avoiding reliance on any *contemporaneous* authority through lineages. The authority transcends time in this way. Early records of Bodhidharma are so vague, and later hagiography embellishes him so extravagantly. As Faure suggests, we should treat

---

240 Sueki Fumihiko (1997) "Nara jidai no zen" 奈良時代の禅, in Sueki Fumihiko, ed., *Zen to shisō* 禅と思想, Tokyo: Perikansha, pp. 77-108, pp. 83, 102. Cf. Magnin (1979: 122).

241 The lineage as in *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* (內證佛法相承血脈譜, DZ 2: 202-3): Bodhidharma—Shenxiu 神秀 (606?-706)—Puji 普寂 (651-739)—Dōsen 道璿 (702-660)—Gyōhyō 行表 (722-797)—Saichō.

Bodhidharma not as an individual but as a "textual paradigm."[242] According to this view, Bodhidharma's function is mainly as a literary trope. The change of attitude towards Bodhidharma, from an Indian to a patriarch, is one important indicator of the development of early Chan. Bodhidharma was not seen as the "First Patriarch of Zen" but simply as an Indian monk who had come to China through the Western territories. Entering the seventh century, the characteristics of Bodhidharma as a traveller across state boundaries was emphasised more. As Yanagida writes, "there was no need to talk about "international" since Bodhidharma was in fact a living dialogue between India and China."[243]

Concluding Remarks

This chapter discussed three aspects of Saichō's learning concerning the Chan precepts. The first aspect outlines the political function of the establishment of ordination platforms, which explains the reason why Saichō saw precepts as a source of protection for the state. The second aspect is the doctrinal influence he received from Dōsen and Daosui. Dōsen's integration of "Northern Chan" teachings and Bodhisattva precepts provides a foundation for Saichō's grasp of Chan and precepts before he went to China. His short stay in southern China enforced his feeling of ethnic tension, which was reflected in Daosui's teachings of Perfect (Bodhisattva) precepts. All the Chinese monks' teachings on emptiness,

---

[242] Bernard Faure (1986), 'Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm', in *History of Regions* 25. 3, pp. 187-198.

[243] Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 (2001), "Passion for Zen: Two Talks at the San Francisco Zen Center", translated and introduced by Urs App, in *The Eastern Buddhist* XXXIII, 2 (2001), pp. 62- 96, quoted from p. 69.

threefold learning, meditation and Perfect precepts were integrated into Saichō's *endonkai*. The third aspect is about Saichō and his disciples' conception of the figure Bodhidharma, whose symbolic image proves to be particularly significant in precept conferral and lineage invention. This conceptualisation originated in Daoxin's community in late seventh century China. Bodhidharma as an authoritative figure was used in various ways by the Japanese Tendai monks, and yet their understanding of Bodhidharma is basically the same as that of Chinese monks. The coalition of meditation and precepts is fundamentally the same, in its main tenor, as the Chinese threefold learning and Tiantai's Perfect Precepts. These doctrines were all meant to provide new interpretations of theories of enlightenment and discourse on legitimacy. The example of Saichō shows therefore that constraints similar to those experienced in China, e.g. the assumption of living in the age of the "latter Dharma", were met by similar decisions and solutions elsewhere in East Asia.

Chapter Five

The Image of Huisi in the Reincarnation Story of Shōtoku Taishi: Patriarchs from across the Sea

The current chapter focuses on the reincarnation legend dominated by the concept of "the Dharma moves eastward" and it illustrates a mechanism of patriarch invention which links the Chan and Tiantai traditions. The next chapter will discuss the ways in which an increasing sense of legitimacy in Korea and Japan incorporated elements from the tales of Chan patriarchs, and these two chapters about Chan patriarchs prove that the dynamics of the acculturation of Buddhism in ninth century Korea and Japan was in accordance with the sinification of Buddhism in China itself. Shōtoku Taishi 聖徳太子 (Prince Shōtoku, 573-621), our main focus of interest in this chapter, has invited the longstanding interest of modern scholars.[244] His association with Buddhism as the

[244] Discussions on this figure, especially in Japanese scholarship, have mainly centred on his historicity. Ōyama Seiichi 大山誠一 has argued that the very existence of Shōtoku Taishi as a historical figure was fabricated; see Ōyama (2003), *Shōtoku Taishi no shinjitsu* 聖徳太子の真実, Tokyo: Heibonsha. For an updated study on Buddhism under the patronage of Shōtoku Taishi, see Sone Masato 曾根正人 (2007), *Shōtoku Taishi to Asuka Bukkyō* 聖徳太子と飛鳥仏教, Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan. For a study of the complicated process of the construction of the Shōtoku Taishi legend, particularly in relation to Korean immigrants, see Michael Como (2008), *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition*, New York: Oxford University Press. For an early consideration of the Shōtoku cult in relation to the introduction of Buddhism in Japan, see J.H. Kamstra (1967), *Encounter or Syncretism*: *The Initial Growth of*

earliest major figure in Japan makes him a starting point for historical discussions on Japanese Buddhism, as well as on Sino-Japan cultural interaction. The cult of Shōtoku Taishi was a far-reaching movement across Japan throughout several centuries, and the belief that he was Huisi's reincarnation is just one element in the extensive cult centred on this figure.[245] The current chapter focuses on the mostly neglected connection between this prince and Chan/Zen Buddhism.[246] We will be shedding light, without regard to later sectarian boundaries, on the connections between the Japanese Prince and the legend cycles of the Chinese patriarch Huisi (515-577).[247] Conspicuously, this reincarnation story has been put

---

Japanese Buddhism, Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill. For a more recent general orientation, see Richard Bowring (2005), *The Religious Traditions of Japan, 500-1600***,** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 20-22.

245 Discussions about other Japanese Buddhist schools may also begin from Shōtoku Taishi. See for example, Robert F. Rhodes (2006), "The Beginning of Pure Land Buddhism in Japan: From its Introduction through the Nara Period", *Japanese Religions* 31.1 (2006), pp. 1-22. The current chapter follows the literature review provided in *ibid*, pp. 1-8.

246 Taking a different perspective, Wang Yung's research looks at the syncretism of Chinese and Japanese cultural elements in the legend of Shōtoku. It emphasises the effect of cultural interaction and hence amounts to a cross-sectarian approach. Wang Yung 王勇(1994), *Shōtoku Taishi jikū chōetsu: rekishi o ugokashita Eshi kōshin setsu* 聖徳太子時空超越：歴史を動かした慧思後身説, Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten.

247 Since he was already discussed in Chapter Two, a summary notice on this important figure will suffice here. Nanyue Huisi (Jap. Nangaku Eshi) 南岳慧思 was the master of Tiantai Zhiyi 智顗 (538–597). According to Huisi's biography in the *Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks,* he was at first inspired by the *Most Wonderful Meditation Sutra* 最妙勝定經, and then joined the group led by Huiwen 慧文 in Northern Qi. (T 50, No. 2060, p. 563c.) For a study of Huisi's life, see Paul Magnin (1979). *La vie et l'œuvre de Huisi (515-577) : les origines de la secte bouddhique chinoise du Tiantai*, Paris, École Française d'Extrême-

to use by Tendai followers in Japan from the eighth century onwards. Amongst the texts that have come down to us, it is rather interesting that the authors of these texts, including both Japanese and Chinese ones, had subtle, but sturdy connections between each other. These connections, when aligned with the historical context, can be seen to manifest a continuing and developing agenda on the part of Buddhist monks, especially in connection with lineage invention. For this reason, we first look into the narratives to find out their underlying logic and the mechanism of lineage invention. In the reincarnation legend, since a trans-historical connection is made between two major figures, the reincarnation connection is in a way equivalent to a lineage. The purpose of the construction of the reincarnation is to provide legitimacy and authority in Buddhist transmission, which is otherwise difficult to be granted. The mechanism of lineage making includes various methods: the most straightforward one is the master-disciple transmission narrated in Buddhist hagiographies. However, another method, as Chapters One and Four illustrate, a lineage could be created through scripture connections. This chapter introduces a third method of lineage construction, namely thr use of a reincarnation story as a lineage device. This, once set in motion, continued for centuries in Japan, and was carried forward most notably by the Tendai monks. It is from their texts that the reincarnation stories centred on Shōtoku Taishi were incorporated into a lineage making process. The lineage was centred on the Chinese patriarch Huisi more than the Japanese Prince, because the

---

Orient : Adrien-Maisonneuve. Cf. Huisi's on image and works, Daniel B. Stevenson and H. Kanno (2006), *The Meaning of the Lotus Sutra's Course of Ease and Bliss: an annotated translation and study of Nanyue Huisi's (515-577) Fahua jing anlexing yi*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Sōka University, especially Chapter 1, "Nanyue Huisi in Buddhist History", pp. 1-44.

figure of Huisi could be presented as a foreign patriarch. A patriarch from across the sea in China was necessary because of the concept of the movement of the Dharma, shifting from west to east. It is a logic similar to the need for the promotion of the Indian Patriarch Bodhidharma in China. In this aspect alone, the invention of this legend shared much ground with lineage invention in the eighth century China, in which the importance of Bodhidharma increased within the centre-periphery framework of the Buddhist worldview.

The motif of the foreignness of patriarchs has at least one root in Sino-Indian relations. Chinese Buddhists suffered from a "borderland complex" towards India in the context of the centre-pheriphery framework. For instance, Daoxuan (596-667), as a leading Chinese monk of his time, was puzzling about whether the Buddhist centre should be China or India.[248] However, Chinese clergy seem to have overcome their feeling of uneasiness and their state of dilemma during the seventh to eighth centuries. (Sen 2003: 11-12) The Tang period saw a straightforward declaration of China as the centre of the Buddhist world. In examining the ways in which the prophecies of the demise of Buddhist doctrines went through modifications in China and were employed to legitimize the usurpation of Empress Wu Zetian, Tansen Sen (2003: 87) concludes:

> While the demise of Buddhism in India seemed apparent, in China the doctrine had gained a strong foothold and thrived under rulers such as Emperor Wu of the Liang dynasty, Emperor Wen of the Sui dynasty, and Wu Zetian in the seventh century…. Within the context of the

[248] See Chapter Three, cf. Tansen Sen (2003), *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600-1400*, University of Hawai'i Press (reprinted at Delhi, 2004), p.9.

> blossoming of Buddhism in China, the prophecies of the imminent decline of the doctrine were also a concern for the Chinese clergy. At the same time, however, they found an opportunity to link the prophecies to the declining state of the doctrine in India and argue for its renaissance in China.

This process of appropriation and reinvention of theories of the Buddhist centre developed first in China and then in Japan, and is a continuous theme in the reincarnation story. During this period, characterised by large scale cultural exchange, the sense of legitimacy of Japanese Buddhists was intensified by the cultural and diplomatic interactions between China and Japan. According to Bruce Batten, a sense of Japanese cultural identity emerged among the central and regional elites around 700 A.D.[249] Thus the general political environment at the international level dominated the underlying logic of the legend of Shōtoku Taishi and Huisi, just as it had done, with a similar rationale, in the case of the stories of Bodhidharma in China during the seventh to eighth centuries. In this respect, the reincarnation story displays intriguing Sino-Japan relations within the Buddhist tradition. In the early eighth century, Japanese monks were preoccupied with their own position in relation to the Buddhist "motherland" of either China or India, which were to some extent competing foci of respect.

---

[249] Bruce Batten (2003), *To the Ends of Japan: Premodern Frontiers, Boundaries, and Interactions*, Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press, p. 91. Michael Como (2008: 9) basically follows Batten's argument. In another article by Batten, he argues that the external threat from Tang China in the seventh century was a direct cause of the emergence of the *Ritsuryō* state. See Bruce Batten (1986), "Foreign Treat and Domestic Reform: The Emergence of the *Ritsuryō* State", *Monumentica Nipponica* 41.2 (1986), pp. 93-112.

The construction of lineage and authority in the creation of tradition relied on the textuality of Buddhist tradition in general.[250] We argue here that the mechanism for the invention of this particular reincarnation story has its origin in the early Chan tradition. Shōtoku Taishi's image as a culture hero served to redefine Japanese Buddhist traditions, and as a result, prominent monks such as Dōji 道慈 (?-774), Jianzhen 鑑真 (688-763) and Saichō, all had to claim a connection with Shōtoku Taishi. Indeed the process continued right down to Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1262), who incorporated him in his retrospective projection of "seven patriarchs" and wrote a special hymn in his praise. Since precisely analogous things happened to the images of Huisi and Bodhidharma in China, as dealt with in previous chapters, we are talking about a process which functioned over a wide geographical and chronological range.

The relations between transformation and continuity during the process of acculturation of Buddhism lead to a more balanced view.[251] The legends associated with Shōtoku Taishi had a stronger potency in Japan than in China, but the conception of lineage was very definitely in accordance with the early Chan

[250] Even the narrative of *Nihon shoki* drew on Buddhist sources. See Como (2008: 17).

[251] Even though in most cases it is helpful to be familiar with the sectarian roots in China for understanding the transplantation of Buddhism to Japan, it is not always appropriate to regard Japanese Buddhists as mere imitators and receivers of their Chinese fellows. Jinhua Chen's (2008) recent study on the Japanese Tendai sect argues that the Japanese Tendai Esoteric literature could be the origin of some Tiantai scriptures on the Chinese side. See Jinhua Chen (2008), *Legend and Legitimation: The Formation of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan*, Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, vol. 30. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises.

traditions.[252] Japanese writers adopted innovative ways to supersede or even overthrow the central position of China, but they took up the Chinese conception of lineage and authority in Buddhist transmission. The continuity may be seen in the motif of the domestication or acculturation of Buddhism during the eighth and ninth centuries across East Asia. Politics within Buddhism dominated the process of legend invention, whereas, at the same time, the new discourse may have altered or reshaped the self-definition of the Tendai sect from Saichō onwards. Their self-definition relates to how Japanese monks located themselves within the broader context of East Asian Buddhism; their claims in the reincarnation legend reveal the authors' motives to have been a rearrangement of Sino-Japanese relationships by the incorporation of Tiantai and Chan patriarchs – a progress which began in China itself.

Finally, it should be clearly understood that the presentation provided here is based on a cross-sectarian approach to Buddhist history. The intention is to bring out a particular genealogy which transcends both spatial limits and sectarian boundaries. It is widely accepted that the Buddhist sectarian history of China and Japan, largely boosted by hagiographical writing and lineage making, began from around the seventh century.[253] Yet the sectarian identity of medieval Buddhists, such as the authors of the stories of Shōtoku Taishi, demands a better definition.[254] The ideological use of the reincarnation story is an important source

[252] Cf. the section on lineage in Chapter Two.

[253] See Jinhua Chen (1999), *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies.

[254] James Robson's approach overcomes sectarian limitations in his research on the

for disclosing the agendas of medieval Buddhist monks in China and Japan, and these agendas went beyond any sectarian framework. After a brief account of the plot of the reincarnation story of Shōtoku Taishi itself, the main part of the chapter below turns therefore to an analysis of the authors and their mutual relationships. The conclusion will bring out the motives of the authors taking part in the development of the legend, and the continuing agendas of the Chinese and Japanese authors selected will thereby become intelligible.

1. The Reincarnation Story

Shōtoku Taishi 聖徳太子, also known as Prince Umayado 厩戸皇子, was literally the earliest Japanese ruler who provided major patronage for Buddhism introduced from China. The official introduction of Buddhism started during the rule of his father, Emperor Yōmei 用明 (r. 585-587), but the substantial introduction of Buddhism, together with Confucianism and Chinese culture, was put forward by Shōtoku Taishi. According to the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 (Chronicles of Japan), the introduction of Buddhism to Japan occurred first in the significant year 552. However, the *Nihon shoki* account is now generally regarded to be a later fabrication by someone during the early eighth century, possibly by

---

mountain where Huisi dwelled. James Robson (2009), *Power of Place: The Religious Landscape of the Southern Sacred Peak (Nanyue) in Medieval China*, Harvard Univ. Press.

the Japanese monk Dōji in 720.[255] According to several texts written prior to the *Nihon shoki*, such as the *Jōgū Shōtoku Taishi hōō teisetsu*上宮聖徳法王帝説 (Exposition of Dharma King Shōtoku of the Upper Palace) and the *Gangō-ji garan engi* 元興寺伽藍縁起 (Origins of the Gangō-ji Temple), it is now generally accepted that Buddhism was formally transmitted to Japan in 538, or the seventh year of Kimmei. Even this however, is a formal date, and it is quite possible that continental immigrants to Japan had been worshipping Buddhism privately before this year.[256] The year 552, chosen by the compiler of the *Nihon shoki*, was ideologically significant because this year was considered to mark the first year of the Latter Dharma (*mapp*ō).[257] By locating the introduction of Buddhism in this year, the author was in effect attempting to show the superiority of Japan over China.[258] Japan could provide the location for the continued

---

[255] Hayami Tasuku 速水侑 (1986), *Nihon Bukkyōshi: Kodai* 日本仏教史 − 古代 (History of Japanese Buddhism: The Ancient Period), Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, pp. 18-19.

[256] Tamura Enchō 田村円澄 (1972), "Bukkyō no denrai" 仏教の傳来 (The Introduction of Buddhism), in Nakamura Hajime, Kasahara Kazuo and Kanaoka Shōyū, eds., *Ajia Bukkyōshi: Nihon-hen 1, Asuka Nara Bukkyō* アジア仏教史・日本編 1, 仏教史飛鳥奈良仏教 (History of Buddhism in Asia: Japan Part 1, Buddhism in the Asuka and Nara Periods), Tokyo: Kōsei, pp. 53-86, especially p.53.

[257] Tamura Enchō (1959), "Mappō shisō no keisei" 末法思想の形成 (The Formation of Mappō Thought), in Tamura Enchō, *Nihon Bukkyō shisōshi kenkyū* 日本仏教思想史研究 (Studies in the History of Japanese Buddhist Thought), Kyoto: Heirakuji, pp. 277-308.

[258] Tamura Enchō (1963), "Kimmei jūsan-nen Bukkyō toraisetsu to mappō shisō" 钦

transmission of Dharma even at the time of *mappō* when its original light might be thought to be fading. It paved the way for the beginning of the rhetoric of the "theory of eastward flow [of Dharma]" (*tōryū setsu* 東流說). This mobility of Dharma paved the way to the possibility of a shifting authority of Buddhism. It built up the sense of legitimacy of Japanese Buddhists, drawing their model from China, and therefore shows the same rationale which characterizes domestication of Buddhism in China itself, as seen in Chapter Three. Specifically, the legend of Shōtoku Taishi incorporated the main characteristics of lineage narratives which were current in China.

It is said that Shōtoku Taishi wrote commentaries to three important Buddhist sūtras, namely the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* 勝鬘經, the *Lotus Sūtra* 法華經, and the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra* 維摩經. These are known collectively known as the *Sangyō gisho* 三経義疏.Taken as a group, the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* (about Queen Śrīmālā) focuses on political monarchy, the *Lotus Sūtra* is the foundation of the Tendai School and the *Vimalakīrti* represents the importance of lay Buddhists. Thus the combination of these three sūtras seems to represent an attempt to solidify political authority in governing Buddhism. However, beginning with Tsuda Sōkichi (1873–1961), scholars have questioned the authorship of the

明十三年仏教渡来说と末法思想 (The Theory that Buddhism was Transmitted to Japan in the Thirteenth Year of Kimmei and Mappō Thought), in Tamura Enchō, ed., *Nihon Reikishi* 日本歴史 (Japanese History) no. 178, pp. 2-8, especially p.6.

Sangyō gisho.[259] Ogura Toyofumi argued that, with the growing Shōtoku cult in the mid-700's, these commentaries were attributed to Shōtoku Taishi by monks such as Gyōshin 行信 (fl. 738) in order to increase the popularity of their own temple, the Hōryū-ji.[260] Since he was such an important figure in Buddhism, more and more mythical components were added to the biographies of Shōtoku Taishi from the early eighth century onwards, and the reincarnation story studied here is just a small part of the complex cult. What is of particular interest here is that Shōtoku Taishi was connected to the Chinese Tiantai Patriarch Huisi, being said to be his reincarnation. In the relevant accounts (to be listed in the next section), Huisi is described as being reborn as Shōtoku Taishi, and admired for having the compassion to spread Buddhism to a non-Buddhist land.

In the biography of Huisi written by Daoxuan, Huisi is presented as having knowledge of his former lives in Mt. Nanyue. (T50: 562c21) It is noteworthy that in this regard, Huisi's influence was regarded as reaching non-Buddhists as well. Thus, Huisi's past lives are mentioned in non-Buddhist texts. For example, in the *Nanyue zongsheng ji* 南嶽總勝集 (Record of the Collected Highlights of *Nanyue*) by Chen Tianfu 陳田夫 (fl. mid-twelfth century) (T. 51, no. 2097), there is a mention of the "three-life stone" (*Sansheng shi* 三生石) as a

---

259 Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉 (1963), *Tsuda Sōkichi zenshū* 津田左右吉全集 (Complete Works of Tsuda Sōkichi), v. 2, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, pp. 134-7.

260 Ogura Toyofumi 小倉豊文 (1985), "Sangyō gisho Jōgūō-sen ni kansuru gigi" 三経義疏上宮王撰上宮王撰に関する疑義 (Doubts concerning Prince Shōtoku's Authorship of Sangyō gisho), in Tamura Enchō and Kawagishi Kōkyō, eds., *Shōtoku Taishi to Asuka Bukkyō*, Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, pp. 144-167.

proof of Huisi's previous lives.[261] The narrative was meant to emphasise the power of meditation practice. Huisi's supernatural power is further emphasised by the author of *Huisi's Vows* in which it is stated that Huisi will replace Maitreya as a future saviour of the world. (T46: 767c-788b, cf. Chapter Three.) Hence the image of Huisi is a very important theme in the Chinese notion of meditation patriarchs. As Michael Como (2008: 149-150) puts it:

> The legend of Shōtoku as the reincarnation of Hui-ssu was far more than a similar illustration of Shōtoku's supernatural powers. Rather, the legend built upon a long tradition of hagiography concerning Hui-ssu in order to create an image of Shōtoku as a millennial savior…. The result was a legend in which Shōtoku the World Savior was shown in possession of Hui-ssu's sutra, ready to assist all sentient beings in search of salvation.

The legend that Shōtoku Taishi was the reincarnation of Huisi seemed to be widely accepted by Chinese and Japanese Buddhists, and it took effect in the Sino-Japan Buddhist transmission.[262] However, there was obvious counter-evidence to this legend, namely in the years of birth and death of these two figures. Shōtoku Taishi was born in 573, three years earlier than Huisi's death in 577, as recorded in Daoxuan's *Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks* (Continued

---

[261] For a survey of relevant documents, see Wang Yung (1994: 144-5).

[262] It is possible that it is partly due to the spread of this story from the eighth century onwards, that Chinese monks were generally willing to transmit teachings to Japanese monks. See Paul Groner (1984), *Saichō: the establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, Seoul: Po Chin Chai, p. 291. One example is Chinese Tiantai monks' zealous welcome of the visit of Enshū 圓修, a Tendai *zazu*. (*Dainihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書 65: 207-8.)

Biographies of Eminent Monks). Considering the existence of such contradictory evidence, it might seem curious that this story was still widely accepted by medieval Buddhists—there must have been a strong motivation in making up and continuing to maintain the story. The use of this legend is therefore extremely pertinent for understanding the propaganda positions of the authors. Moreover various additions were gradually made to the legend as a result of these positions.

As to sources, the relevant texts may be listed as follows:

A. *Nanyue Si Chanshi famen zhuan* 南岳思禪師法門傳 ("Account of the Dharma-Gate of Meditation Master Nanyue Huisi") by Du Fei 杜朏, probably written during 716-732. Now lost.[263]
B. *Qidai ji* (Jap. *Shichidaiki*) 七代記 ("Story of Seven Lives") (Also known as the *Hiroshima Daihon Taishi den* 廣島大本太子傳), compiled in 771. In the end of this text, there are quotations from the lost text, the *Datang guo Hengzhou Hengshan daochang Shi Huisi chanshi qidai ji* 大唐國衡州衡山道場釋慧思禪師七代記 ("Story of the Seven Lives of *Dhyāna* Master Shi Huisi of Mount Heng, Hengzhou, Great Tang").[264]

---

[263] This book title appears in Ennin's catalogue, *Jikaka daishi zaitō sōshinroku* 慈覚大師在唐送進録，T 55, No. 2166, pp. 1075b; 1077c, T 55. Some quotations survived in Saichō's writings and the other texts listed below, eg. the *Jōgū Taishi shūi ki* 上宮太子拾遺記, BZ 112, pp. 249, 361.

[264] See the *Nara ibun* 寧樂遺文, Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三 (1965), ed., Tokyo: Tōkyōdō shuppan, vol. 3, pp. 893a.10 – 894a.5. For research on this text in relation to the Zen school, see Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 (1997), "Nara jidai no zen" 奈良時代の禅, in *Zen to shisō* 禅と思想, Sueki Fumihiko, ed., Tokyo: Perikansha, pp. 77-108, especially pp. 98- 103. For its authorship, see T. H. Barrett (2009) "Rebirth from China to Japan in Nara Hagiography: A Reconsideration", *Buddhist Studies Review* 26.1 (2009). Based on two odd phrases, "below his epitaph" 碑下題 and "Emperor Li the Third Gentlemen"李三郎帝, appearing in the colophon, Barrett suggests that the *Shichidaiki* was fabricated by a Japanese author, instead of being of Chinese origin as widely accepted. Taking Michael Como's (2008) study on the role of Monk Dōji (? - 744) into consideration, Barrett furthers his proposition that the author is very likely to be Dōji or his Japanese fellows.

C. *Dai Tō denkai shisō myōki daioshō Ganjin den* 大唐伝戒師僧名記大和上鑑真伝 ("Biography of Great Master Jianzhen in a Collection of Names for Vinaya Masters from the Great Tang"; hereafter: *Ganjin den*) by Situo (Jap. Shitaku) 思託 (722-809) and Fajin (Jap. Hōshin) 法進 (709-778).[265]

D. *Tō daioshō tōseiden* **唐大和上東征傳** ("The Account of the Great Tang Master's Eastward Conquest"; Hereafter: *Tōseiden*) by Aomi-no-Mabito Genkai **真人元開** (722-785) in 779.[266]

E. *Jōgū kōTaishi bosatsu den* 上宮皇太子菩薩傳 ("The Biography of the Prince Bodhisattva"; hereafter: *Bosatsu den*) by Situo during 786-794.[267]

F. *Kenkairon* 顕戒論 **上**[268] and the preface poem to the *Nyu Sitennōji Shōtoku Taishibyō Guden Hokkeshū* 入四天王寺聖徳太子廟求傳法華宗 by Saichō.[269]

G. *Denjutsu isshin kaimon* 伝述一心戒文 ("Concerning the Essay on the One-Mind Precepts") by Kōjō 光定 (779 – 858) in 834.[270]

---

[265] It is collected in the *Shōtoku Taishi heishiden zōkanmon* 聖徳太子平氏傳雜勘文 (hereafter: *Zōkanmon*), in *BZ* 112 (the volume of *Shōtoku Taishi den sōsho*), pp. 227-8. *Zōkanmon* is a collection of writings about the life of Shōtoku Taishi.

[266] T51, No. 2089, p. 988a. For French and English translations of this text, see Takakusu Junjirō 高楠 順次郎 (1928-9), "Le voyage de Kanshin", in *Bulletin d'Ecole Francaise de l'Extrême Orient* XXVIII (1928) pp.1-42 (Introduction), pp.442-472 (Translation I); BEFEO XXIX (1929) pp.48-62 (Translation II); Marcus Bingenheimer (2003-4), "A translation of the *Tōdaioshō tōseiden* 唐大和上東征傳 (T.2089 (7))", in *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* No.4 (2003) & No.5 (2004). For some analysis of the appearance of this biography, see Andō Kōsei 安藤**更生** (1960), *Ganjin daioshō den no kenkyū* **鑑真大和上伝之研究**, Tokyo: Heibonsha, pp. 113-4.

[267] See BZ 112, p.1.

[268] DZ (*Eizan daishiden* 叡山大師伝) 1. The end of section 7 in Kenkairon vol. 1. See annotations in Andō Toshio 安藤俊雄 and Sonoda, Kōyū 薗田香融 (1991), eds., *Saichō: Kenkairon, Sange gakushōshiki, tagōhen* 最澄—顕戒論、山家学生式、他五篇, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, p. 46.

[269] DZ 3, p. 447.

[270] For the story of Shōtoku Taishi and his encounter with Bodhidharma, see T 74, No. 2379, 653a- 654c. See especially the mention of the quotation from the "Story of the Seven Lives of *Dhyāna* Master Shi Huisi of Mount Heng, Hengzhou, Great

H. *Jōgū Taishi shūi ki* 上宮太子拾遺記 ("A Record of Gleanings of Jōgū Shōtoku") by Hōkū 法空 (c. 1314).[271]

According to Sueki Fumihiko (1997: 98-99), the origin of the legend probably came from an indication that "Huisi was reborn in a place where there were no Buddhist teachings yet" quoted from the lost text by Du Fei, which is the earliest source for the legend. Judging from the dates of all the texts, Sueki deduced that it is very likely that the story of Huisi's seven lives had already been widely known in Tang China before it was written down. Even so, some Buddhists advocated Huisi's story more than the others, so the question is as to who would be benefited by it.[272] After Du Fei, there are different agendas on the part of the various authors. The political implications of the story are discernible in an expanded version in a biography of Jianzhen, the *Ganjin den.* The authors of the *Ganjin den*, namely Situo and Fajin, were Jianzhen's most influential disciples in Japan. In the *Tōseiden*, a relatively later edition of Jianzhen's biography, the reincarnation story also plays an important part. Later on in Japan, it occurs in Tendai literature by Saichō and his disciples, being mentioned in Saichō's *Kenkairon* and Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshin kaimon*. From Du Fei to Kōjō, the author names listed above represent a variety of Buddhist sects, including Zen, Tendai and Vinaya monks. As the network of the authors shows, a strong, cross-sectarian

---

Tang", p. 653b23. Cf. The section of Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* in Chapter Four.

[271] BZ 112, pp. 2, 6, 8, 115, 225.

[272] In the biographies of Zhiyi written by the Chinese literatus Yan Zhenqing 顏真卿 (written in 784), the monk Guanding 灌頂 (561-632) and others, the story is not mentioned. See *DZ* 4, pp. 175-8; 206-7. It is possible that Chinese writers were not in favour of this story themselves.

connection between the authors is rather obvious. Tracing the network of these authors, we now seek to illustrate the mechanism of the lineage invention and idolisation of patriarchs.

2. Du Fei 杜朏 (c.710 – 720) and Huisi

Du Fei, who composed the earliest text of the reincarnation story, was also the author of the "Record of the Transmission of the Dharma-Jewel" (*Chuan fabao ji* 傳法寶記, ca. 713), a Chan lineage account discovered at Dunhuang.[273] Du Fei was a disciple of Faru 法如 (638-689). The "Record of the Transmission of the Dharma-Jewel" claimed that Monk Faru received the orthodoxy lineage coming down from Bodhidharma: it shows that Du Fei had a keen sense of what a lineage stood for. Hence, the fact that he wrote a biography for Huisi provides an interesting contrast within his ideas of meditator patriarchs.

Another text by Du Fei, "Account of the Dharma-Gate of Meditation Master Nanyue Huisi", is lost, but fortunately quotations from it can be found in the *Shichidaiki* and Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshin kaimon*. This text by Du Fei, according to the quotation, is important because it appears to be the earliest occurrence of the rebirth stories of Huisi. Its mention of a 'non-Buddhist country' brings

---

[273] According to this text, the transmission line runs as follows: Bodhidharma, Daoyu道育, Huike 慧可 (487? - 593), Sengcan 僧璨 (d.606), Daoxin 道信 (580 - 651), Hongren 弘忍 (601 - 674), Faru 法如 (638-689) and Shengxiu 神秀 (606? - 706). For Du Fei and the *Chuan fabao ji*, see Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 (1967), *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū*, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, pp. 47-50.

forward the possibility of a Japanese connection. Huisi's sympathy for the non-Buddhist land is along the lines of the compassion of a bodhisattva. It also hints at the supernatural power of knowing one's destination in the next life, which was much valued by meditation practitioners.

The fact that Du Fei was the author of both Huisi's story and a Chan lineage account indicates a shared readership in Chan and Tiantai circles.

Historical evidence also shows the connection between Du Fei and Chan groups. Du Fei once gave lectures to Puji 普寂 (851 – 739) at the *Dafuxian si* 大福先寺 in the capital Luoyang 洛陽. (Yanagida 1967: 48) Puji was Shenxiu's 神秀 (606? – 706) disciple and later became the mentor of Dōsen 道璿 (702-760), who transmitted Chan teachings to Gyōhyō 行表 (722 – 797). Gyōhyō then became the direct supervisor of Saichō. This transmission line facilitated the passage of Du Fei's perception of Bodhidharma and Huisi to Saichō and his disciples. A common feature of Puji, Dōsen and Gyōhyō is that they all learnt Tiantai, Chan and Vinaya, and also, they all transmitted the meditation associated with the Bodhidharma strand of tradition.[274]

Furthermore, the images of Huisi and Bodhidharma are very similar in Du Fei's "Record of the Transmission of the Dharma-Jewel" and Daoxuan's "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" in terms of their response to the suppression by contemporary monks. (Sueki 1997: 102-3) The similarity between the images of these two figures may be part of the reason for the confusion between the *Bodhidharma edition* and *Huisi Edition* of the *Bodhisattva Precepts*

[274] For Saichō's teachings of the Bodhidharma system, see Sueki (1997: 83, 96).

Conferral Manual, which are in fact probably not two separate editions at all.[275] It shows that Du Fei regarded the two masters as a similar type of meditation practitioner. It is very likely that the similarity between Huisi and Bodhidharma's images was also widely perceived in the eighth century. The direct link between Huisi and Bodhidharma developed continuously in the story of Huisi's rebirth. The encounter of these two figures in the "Account of the Dharma-Gate of Meditation Master Nanyue Huisi" quoted in the *Shichidaiki* intensifies the similar elements of these two patriarchs: meditation practitioner, supernatural powers of awareness of past lives and rebirth in a different country. According to the *Shichidaiki*, Huisi was said to have met Bodhidharma, who encouraged Huisi to be reborn in Japan for his next life. Other versions even go so far to proclaim that Shōtoku Taishi himself met Bodhidharma on a mountain, when Bodhidharma pretended to be a poor and hungry old man. It is quite clear that the authors of these stories tried to build a connection between Huisi, Bodhidharma and Shōtoku Taishi. The meeting between Bodhidharma and Shōtoku Taishi was strongly advanced by Kōjō in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, where both the *Shichidaiki* and the lost "Account of the Dharma-Gate of Meditation Master Nanyue Huisi" are quoted. Kōjō asserted this connection to demonstrate that Bodhidharma was close to the Tendai School. The close relationship between the Chan and Tiantai traditions can be seen in the borrowing, combining and inventing between these two patriarchs.

---

[275] (Sueki 1997: 102) The *Bodhidharma edition* and *Huisi Edition* are discussed in Chapter Four.

3. Jianzhen 鑑真 (688-763) and Huisi

The link between Huisi and Jianzhen is shown both in their doctrinal consistency and in the geographical facts. First of all, Jianzhen and Huisi were both active in southern China. The Yangzhou Longxingsi 揚州龍興寺, where Jianzhen was ordained and spent all his teenage years, was a famous temple in that region.[276] According to the description about Yangzhou Longxingsi in Ennin's diary, there was a portrait of Huisi inside the Lotus Hall of this temple; while inside its Eastern Tower Hall, there was a statue of and a biographical inscription concerning Jianzhen.[277] It is said that, after making the decision to depart for Japan, in order to physically demonstrate his reverence to Huisi, Jianzhen then took a pilgrimage to Mount Heng (*Nanyue*) where Huisi resided.[278] It seems Jianzhen had realised the importance of a closer Sino-Japanese tie to himself and so began to build up his connection with Huisi as a role model before departing for Japan. He could then claim himself to be Huisi's successor in promoting meditation and precepts in Japan.

Jianzhen's education indicates a syncretic approach in that he learnt Tiantai, Chan, and precepts. According to the *Tōseiden* (T51: 988b), Jianzhen first learnt precepts and Chan (*Chanmen* 禪門) from Master Zhiman 智満 at Yangzhou Dayunsi 揚州大雲寺. Later he studied precepts from the fourth Tiantai

---

[276] See Andō Kōsei 安藤更生(1958), *Ganjin* 鑑真 (688-763), Tokyo: Bijutsu shuppansha, pp. 22-5.

[277] Ennin's *Nittō guhō junrei gyōki* 入唐求法巡礼行記, vol. 1. (BZ 113: 183b)

[278] Andō Kōsei (1958: 130). Jianzhen also went to Zhiyi's monastery in Mount Tiantai and the Six Chan Patriarch Huineng's *Faquansi* in Shaozhou as a pilgrim.

Patriarch Hongjing 弘景 (634-712) at the Yuquansi 玉泉寺. The Yuquansi was a monastery famous for syncretic teachings, including Tiantai, Chan, Vinaya and Esoteric Buddhism. For example, Esoteric Master Yixing 一行 (683 – 727), Hongjing's student, lived here and Shenxiu resided at Yuquansi for some time. Moreover, Puji, who was Shenxiu's disciple and once studied under Du Fei, also came to the Yuquansi to learn from Hongjing. Hence, it is obvious that Jianzhen had an adequate connection with the Chan circle. This fact corresponds to a long-lasting trend in southern China — a cross-transmission between Chan and Vinaya (*Chan Lü huchuan* 禪律互傳).[279]

Judging from a surviving list of the texts he brought to Japan with him, the large number of Tiantai scriptures indicates his preference for the teachings of that tradition.[280] Meanwhile, the Tang aristocracy during his time were fairly well aware of his study on the Tiantai teachings. This supposition is supported by the occurrence of the *Inscription for the Tower of the Monk who Crossed the Seas* 過海和尚塔銘 (*Guohai heshang taming*) written by Liang Su 梁肅(753-793).[281] Liang Su was an outstanding writer in the Tang and has been known for his close

[279] For instance, it was said that Vinaya Master Dao'an 道岸 (654-712) dreamed of Mahākāśyapa 摩訶迦葉 giving instructions. See Yanagida (1967: 198). See also Chapter Two, the section on vinaya transmission, and Chapter Three for the transmission of Bodhisattva precepts in the Chan tradition.

[280] For a list of the items and scriptures Jianzhen brought to Japan, see *Tōseiden*, T 51, No. 2059, 993a.

[281] The original has been lost. A relevant citation can be found in the *Quan Tang Wen* 480. The "Monk who Crossed the Seas" refers to Jianzhen.

relationship with some famous Tiantai monks.[282] Thus the fact that Liang Su wrote an inscription for Jianzhen implies that the Tiantai circle was quite familiar to the latter as well. One may therefore draw the conclusion that it was quite common for Buddhist followers during that time to train themselves with both Vinaya and Tiantai teachings.

4. Situo 思託 (722-809) and Jianzhen

Among the texts listed, Situo is the author of two biographies, the *Ganjin den* and the *Bosatsu den*: those of Jianzhen and Shōtoku Taishi respectively. Situo mentions the reincarnation legend in both of them, and the way he depicts Jianzhen, Huisi and Shōtoku Taishi reveals his own agenda. Accompanying Jianzhen, Situo came to Japan in 753 and from that time on became Jianzhen's most reliable disciple.[283] While dwelling first in the Tōdaiji 東大寺 and later Tōshōdaiji 唐昭提寺, in order to establish an ordination platform, Jianzhen encountered criticism and oppression from other Japanese Buddhists.[284] Tsuji Zennosuke argues that Situo invented the reincarnation story as a political strategy

[282] For Liang Su's thought in relation to Buddhism, see Guo Zhonghan 郭中翰 (1998), *Liang Su (753-793 C.E.) and the Restoration of Literature (wen-chang or literary compositions) as well as the Learning of Nature and Destiny in the mid-T'ang China*, MA dissertation (1998), National Ching Hwa University, Taiwan.

[283] Situo and Fajin were the most important disciples of Jianzhen. For their roles and works, see Wang Yung (1994: 156-166).

[284] For further details about Jianzhen's ordination platform, see Bowring (2005: 86-87).

to compete with other Buddhist groups.[285] Although it is unlikely that Situo fully invented the reincarnation story, it is reasonable that Situo promoted this legendary story in order to assure the legitimacy of his master.

According to Situo's *Bosatsu den*, firstly, Huisi was depicted as mastering four kinds of meditation and practising asceticism (*toutuo xing* 頭陀行) on Mount Nanyue. Huisi once said that both he and Zhiyi were in attendance at Śākyamuni Buddha's preaching of the *Lotus Sutra* on Mount Grdhrakuta.[286] Then, it goes on to state that Huisi erected a "three-life stone" on the mountain, which served to prove that he knew his past lives clearly and had ability to decide his location of rebirth. By comparison, Daoxuan's "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" has no mention of Huisi's rebirth in the next life. According to what Situo laid out, the image of Shōtoku Taishi and Huisi highlights their supernatural ability in the knowledge of former lives, and at the same time their persistence in meditation practice. In the same text, it says that Shōtoku Taishi often lent a hand to common people with expedient methods, just as a bodhisattva would do. Through the prince, the *Lotus Sutra* was propagated for the first time. More interestingly, Situo emphasised that Shōtoku Taishi practised meditation regularly and achieved a fairly advanced stage in meditation, because he often

---

[285] Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 (1929), "Shōtoku Taishi Eshi zenshi goshin setsu nikansuru gi" 聖徳太子慧思禅師後身説に関する疑, in *Reikishi Chiri* 歴史地理 53.1, pp. 1-13, reprinted in Tsuji (1931), *Nihon Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* (zokuhen) 日本仏教史の研究　続編, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

[286] Huisi's biography in Daoxuan's "Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks" mentions that Huisi told Zhiyi that he himself and Zhiyi were both on Mount Gṛdhrakuta when Śākyamuni was preaching the *Lotus Sutra*. Presumably Situo did not take it literally, but is emphasising that, since Huisi was saying that he had such a past life, this "recollection" was a proof of Huisi's supernatural abilities.

entered samādhi (*ruding* 入定) for one, three or even five days. The contemporary people did not understand what meditation (*Chan ding* 禪定) was and simply thought him as having "entered the hall of dreams."[287] It is also emphasised that Shōtoku Taishi did not lose the memory of his past life as a Chinese patriarch, and therefore he asked his younger sister to visit the Tang in order to bring back a sutra and other items left over from his previous life.

Situo's depiction of both Huisi and Shōtoku Taishi is often quoted in later editions of stories of Shōtoku Taishi. His narrative was accepted and then expanded into other versions of story. The writings on Shōtoku Taishi seem to develop so freely that connections were built up between Shōtoku Taishi, Huisi, Bodhidharma, Lady Śrīmālā and even Kōbō Daishi, were built up in the *Zōkanmon* and the *Taishi den kokon mokuroku shō.* Thus, in the *Zōkanmon* (BZ112: 229) and the *Taishi den kokon mokuroku shō* 太子傳古今目錄鈔 (BZ 112: 71), the story is elaborated in the assertions that Shōtoku Taishi (and Huisi) was the reincarnation of the Lady Śrīmālā in an earlier time and of Kōbō daishi 弘法大師 (Kūkai 空海, 774-835) at a later time. The reincarnation story comprised of these big names has provided convenient approaches for Buddhist followers to convince others of a distinct origin for their lineage. The fact that the story was so well absorbed and expanded by later Buddhists is proof that the connection between Shōtoku Taishi and Huisi corresponded to the needs of medieval Buddhists. To understand Situo's strategy in combining the Chinese patriarch and

---

[287] "Entering the hall of dreams": *ru mengtang* 入夢殿. The "hall of dreams" (Jp. *yumedono* 夢殿), incorporated in the architecture of Hōryūji, can be visited to this day.

Japanese prince in order to honour his own master Jianzhen, it is instructive to compare the *Bosatsu den* to Jianzhen's biography by Situo.

As quoted in Jianzhen's biography the reincarnation story appears in the section with Jianzhen's speech about his decision to depart for Japan. The conversation occurred during the time when sea transportation was fairly dangerous and only few Chinese masters dared to travel to Japan at the risk of their lives.[288] When Japanese monks, namely Eiei 榮叡 and Fushō 普照, invited Jianzhen to go to Japan with them in 742. Eiei and Fushō began their petition by saying that,

> "The teachings of the Buddha have flowed east and reached Japan. But although these teachings are there, nobody has [properly] transmitted them. In Japan there was once Shōtoku Taishi, who said that after 200 years, the holy teachings would prosper in Japan. Now the hour has come. We beseech the Great Master to venture to the East and take charge of the advancement [of Buddhism]."[289]

In hearing that, and meeting the expectation of all the other people in attendance, Jianzhen gave a positive reply to the invitation. He said that,

---

[288] Master Jianzhen from Yangzhou region was regarded as the earliest monk who bravely travelled across the dangerous sea to Japan, so his contemporaries called him "the monk who crossed the sea" (*Guohai heshang* 過海和尚). See the section of "Fofa guo haidong" 佛法過海東 in Li Zhao's 李肇 (fl. 806-820) *Tang Guoshi Bu* 唐國史補 卷上, vol. 1, Shanghai : Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1957. p. 23.

[289] *Tōseiden*, in T51, No. 2089, 988b. The translation is from Marcus Bingenheimer (2003: 171).

> "A long time ago I heard that the Meditation Master Huisi from Nanyue after his demise was reincarnated as a prince in Japan to promulgate Buddhism and enlighten the people [there]. I have also heard that in Japan there was *Nagayaō* 長屋王 (684-729), who deeply revered Buddhism. I understand this to imply that [Japan] is a good country in which to propagate Buddhism."[290]

It is significant that Jianzhen mentioned Huisi on this special occasion. In this way, Jianzhen expressly claimed an inheritance from Huisi, who was himself equivalent to the respected Japanese prince. To make the Chinese patriarch a more sufficient role model, Situo went on to refer to the anecdote about Huisi's first meeting with his successor, Zhiyi. Huisi recognised Zhiyi's past life and told Zhiyi that they had received Śākyamuni Buddha's preaching of the Lotus Sutra on Mount Gṛdhrakuta. Thereupon, Zhiyi immediately attained the one-vehicle sudden enlightenment.[291] Following this anecdote, Situo concludes that,

> "Hence, we know that *Dhyāna* Master [Hui]Si, in terms of his earlier practice, recited the Lotus Sutra as well as contemplating deeply in *dhyāna*. [One day,] all of a sudden, his views instantly cleared up and he achieved enlightenment by attaining the *Lotus samādhi*. … Zhiyi relentlessly devoted himself to his Buddhist career in the Tang

[290] T 51, 988b. The translation is adapted from Bingenheimer (2003: 171-2). Compare with the *Ganjin den*, in *BZ* 112, p. 228.

[291] This may be identified with the *Lotus samādhi* (*Hokke zanmai* 法華三昧), which appears later in the same passage.

> country; and likewise *Dhyāna* Master [Hui]Si cultivated and transformed sentient beings to the East of the sea." (BZ 112: 228b)

Situo brings out Huisi and Zhiyi as a pair of Buddhist sages who devoted themselves to help sentient beings, in the spirit of Mahāyāna bodhisattvas. By claiming that one of them remained in China and the other was reborn in Japan, China and Japan become 'twin' countries in terms of Buddhist transmission. It also implied that Japan was an important place that urgently needed Chinese masters to transmit Buddhism. It is not difficult to see that it was necessary for Jianzhen's disciple to provide a strong reason for travelling overseas from China to Japan. By pairing the two sages Huisi and Zhiyi, Japan and China become a pair, too. Then, by admiring Huisi's decision to be reborn in Japan, Situo meant to propose that his master Jianzhen, in choosing to travel to Japan, was as great as the two big names. In this context, it is understandable that Situo spent more than half the space for Huisi in the biography which he dedicated to his master, the *Ganjin den*. The fact that Huisi was singled out for particular respect in this way indicates that Situo valued the Tiantai tradition, even if Situo and his associates referred to themselves as Vinaya masters who had the intention of transmitting proper monastic codes to Japan. Situo's respect for Tiantai is in accordance with Jianzhen's connection with the Chinese Tiantai circle, which will be discussed below.

5. Saichō and Huisi

Saichō was not an author of any versions of the reincarnation story, but his mention of this story illustrates his view of Huisi. After Saichō, the appropriation process of the legend by his disciples is ultimately related to the reshaping of Tendai's self-definition in Japan.[292] It is interesting to note Saichō's reverent attitude to Huisi in medieval times, because compared with modern Tendai /Tiantai scholars, the emphasis on Zhiyi is out of balance—Saichō refers to Huisi's teachings more than modern scholars do.

Since Saichō quoted and emphasised this story many times in his writings, the writers on Shōtoku like to quote Saichō as well. For example, it is written in the *Shōtoku Taishi den kokon mokuroku shō* 聖徳太子伝古今目錄抄 that Saichō eulogised Huisi's seven lives in China before his eighth life as Shōtoku Taishi.[293] It is also mentioned in Saichō's *Kenkairon* and the prefatory poem to the *Nyū Shitennōji Shōtoku Taishibyō Guden Hokkeshū*.[294] Later on, Saichō's disciple Kōjō spent remarkable space in the *Denjutsu isshin kaimon* on expounding this legend in detail. In this regard, it seems that the reincarnation story quite definitely expedited the promotion of the Tendai School by Saichō and

---

[292] Como (2008: 133- 153) also notices that Japanese Buddhist apologists up to Saichō have put Shōtoku Taishi at the centre in building up the Tendai tradition and its self-definition. Through a survey of the efforts done by several Japanese monks, namely Dōji, Ganjin (Jianzhen), Huisi and Saichō, he argues that the Shōtoku cult eventually brought about the Nara-Heian Buddhist transition.

[293] *BZ* 112, p. 50. Also in DZ 4, p. 747. The original text reads: "傳教大師讚云, 剋七生於大唐, 現一生於日本, 位登初信, 妙解圓融 云云."

[294] For an analysis of Saichō's writings see Sonoda Kōyū 薗田香融 (1991), "Saichō to sono shisō" 最澄とその思想, in *Saichō: Kenkairon, Sange gakushōshiki, tagōhen*, pp. 462-70.

his followers. The reason is not difficult to fathom because the reincarnation of Shōtoku Taishi vindicates the argument that Tendai should be in the central place in Japanese Buddhism. Saichō and his followers adopted this strategy out of political considerations because of the ferocious competition between Buddhist groups in the Heian Period (794-1185).

The competition between the Sanron 三論 and the Hossō 法相 groups was fierce during early Heian, and Emperor Kammu 桓武天皇 (737-806, r. 782-806) attempted to balance the two sects by encouraging Buddhist monks to learn Sanron teachings. Probably in order to resolve the competition between these Nara sects, Saichō mounted a criticism of all six Nara sects in his proposal *Shōnittō shōyakuhyō* 請入唐請益表 to study in Tang China.[295] Saichō first denigrated the śāstra-centred Sanron and Hossō, and then he praised the value of the *Lotus Sūtra* and the Tendai School. By asserting the higher status of sūtras over śāstras, the Tendai School was elevated over both Sanron and Hossō.[296] Saichō probably realised that Huisi was in a similar situation, in China, in that they both faced opponents from exegetical traditions.[297] As to Huisi's need to resist the dominant exegetical Buddhism, his strategy of overcoming it by championing meditation may also have influenced Saichō in reflecting on the Japanese Buddhist environment.

---

[295] *Eizan daishiden* 叡山大師伝, pp. 11-12. For an analysis of this text in relation to state Buddhism, see Sone Masato 曾根正人 (2000), *Kodai Bukkyōkai to ōchō shakai* 古代仏教会と王朝社会, Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, pp. 171-184.

[296] Jinhua Chen also shows convincingly that the *Ehyō Tendai shū* 依憑天臺集 was a product of Saichō's attempt to fight with Hossō. (Chen 1999: 121 -126)

[297] See Chapter Two about Huisi's battles with exegetical monks.

Saichō began to be interested in the Chinese Tiantai School while in Japan, but among the Tiantai masters, Saichō seemed to find Huisi particularly appealing. Some other schools were also based on sūtras instead of śāstras in China, so the *Lotus Sūtra*'s attractiveness cannot have been the only factor in Saichō's interest in the Tiantai. In addition, given that Huisi was one of the earliest masters advocating meditation practice against the one-sided exegetical tradition, one finds many parallels between Huisi's background and Saichō's circumstances. Since Saichō was at first attracted by the meditation section in the Tiantai teachings brought by Jianzhen, it is safe to conclude that Huisi's teachings and stories greatly inspired Saichō and became part of his motivation to learn Tiantai from China.

Through the scriptures brought by Jianzhen, Saichō had a chance to read the texts of the Chinese Tiantai School. As discussed above, among the Tiantai teachings, Jianzhen was particularly interested in Huisi. Saichō learnt about Huisi through the media of Jianzhen's collection of Tiantai books, and perhaps together with the latter's comments and reference to Huisi. Taken together, Huisi, Jianzhen and Saichō seem to have inherited the same transmission, almost a 'lineage', centred on Huisi.

It is noteworthy that the reincarnation legend brings Sino-Japan Buddhist relations closer. Saichō's reinterpretation of the legend presents a new apprehension of Japan's position within the Buddhist world. As Como and Barrett have both suggested, narratives of an "otherworldly communion of saints" (in Barrett's phrase) are not uncommon during this period; they serve to create a direct link to the Buddhist origin of India. (Como 2008: 151; Barrett 2009) By stating that Japan's Tendai originated from Master Huisi, who was even earlier

than the celebrated Master Zhiyi, the Tendai School could assert its own interest in maintaining that Japan was not inferior to China.[298]

Concluding Remarks

The current chapter provides cross-sectarian research on the connections between the legend cycles of the Chinese patriarch Huisi and Shōtoku, the Japanese prince. The reincarnation story arose during a time when issues concerning sectarian lineages were increasing in significance. Reincarnation represents doctrinal continuation as well as transmission of authority. In this way reincarnation fulfils the same function as lineage construction, and is therefore equally significant during a time when a tradition is being created. In the meantime, images of patriarchs were being fabricated in order to solidify the lineages. In the case of early Chan Buddhism, the image of Huisi, as discussed in Chapter Two, was one important source for the ideal of a meditation practitioner. The image of Huisi conveys the notion of a patriarch in both Chan and Tiantai circles in China and Japan. Huisi's image was idolised by Du Fei, who also wrote one of the earliest accounts of Bodhidharma's lineage. Likewise, the story of Shōtoku, closely connected to the authors of the *Nihon shoki,* was composed to explain the introduction of Buddhism. It is conspicuous that in both China and Japan, the founder of a tradition must be a foreign patriarch. As a result,

[298] It should be noted that some scholars have different views about the position of Japan position in Saichō's mind. Como notices Saichō's concern to place Tendai at the centre of Japanese Buddhism by linking itself to India. In Jinhua Chen's (1999: 137, 140) study on the *Ehyō Tendai shū,* he argues that Saichō attempted to argue that China had superseded India in terms of Buddhist development.

Bodhidharma, Huisi and Shōtoku Taishi were shaped as patriarchs coming from a Buddhist motherland. This narrative implies the logic of a centre-periphery framework, and the corresponding "Dharma moved east" belief in the Latter Dharma period. Read in this light, these narratives in the eighth and ninth centuries are informative regarding the formation of Chinese and Japanese monks' religious identity. Japanese monks' self-definition matured as the reincarnation story developed into a completed form. The self-definition involves how Japanese monks located themselves in a broader context of East Asian Buddhism. Hence it is argued that the Huisi reincarnation legend reveals the authors' motives with respect to rearranging the association between China and Japan.

The mechanism of patriarch making in this reincarnation story is just like that in the Chinese lineage accounts. The authors, and their invention, all represent a lineage as well. The Chinese writer Du Fei is important for conveying similar images of Huisi and Bodhidharma, and he showed an inclination to bring these two figures closer by means of an encounter. The same theme was then taken up by Saichō's disciple Kōjō for an encounter between Bodhidharma and Shōtoku Taishi. Besides representing the image of a meditation practitioner, Huisi was also a key figure in the transmission of Chinese Buddhism across the sea. Jianzhen and Situo shared the same motivation of a closer Sino-Japanese tie, as is seen through their connecting of themselves to Shōtoku Taishi through Huisi. Jianzhen seems to have been building up his connection with the role model Huisi before departing for Japan. He could then claim himself as Huisi's successor in promoting meditation and precepts in Japan. This story was particularly valued by the Tendai School in the ninth century. To Saichō and his followers, it brings Sino-Japan Buddhist relations into closer touch, and, meanwhile, through stating

that Japan had acquired Master Huisi, who was even earlier than the celebrated patriarch Zhiyi, it implies that Japan was not inferior to China. This was the underlying logic of a sustainable ideology which was able to locate Japan in general, and Tendai in particular, at the centre of the Buddhist world, so as to win the fierce competition between various Buddhist groups within the country.

Taking all these authors together, the reincarnation story illustrates a mechanism of patriarch invention which links the Chan and Tiantai traditions. Despite the additions by Japanese writers, there is clearly a remarkable continuity in the rhetorical strategy from China to Japan. At the same time their creativity contributes to the richness of imagination in the story line and to a multiplex scheme for promoting Buddhism.

Chapter Six

The Writings of Kōjō 光定 (779–858) and Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn 崔致遠 (b. 857): The Role of Chan Buddhism in the Acculturation of Buddhism

This chapter aims to evaluate how Chan Buddhism played a part in Buddhist discourses reflecting an increased sense of legitimacy. Its purpose is to further the investigation of ninth century perceptions from outside China during the domestication or acculturation of Buddhism on the basis of the studies done in Chapters Three, Four and Five. It is interesting to note that for each of the ninth century writers of the bibliographies and commentaries cited in this thesis, parallels can be found in the Korean and Japanese perceptions of Chan Buddhism. During the ninth century, there was a rise in the consciousness of sense of legitimacy which tended to emphasise the concept of centre versus periphery in East Asian Buddhism. For this reason, Buddhist intellectuals strove to devise new methods that enabled them to incorporate elements of the ideal image of Chan, namely Bodhidharma's lineage, ascetic power and the concept of being the centre. As the texts analysed in this chapter will show, both Kōjō 光定 (779-858) and Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn 崔致遠 (b. 857) incorporated elements of Chinese Chan Buddhism into discourses of their own cultural identity, thus revealing an attempt to make their own country the central state in the Buddhist world. In other words, this type of discourse reflects a self-image constructed in the framework of the centre-periphery concept. The driving force of the reconstruction of cultural

identity was rooted in the contemporaneous context at an international level. In the ninth century, intensive interaction among Buddhists, merchants and court officials from China, Japan and Korea led to cultural encounters and a subsequent rise of sense of legitimacy. As far as the Japanese and Korean writings go, the intention and method of persuasion presented an early form of the nationalisation of Buddhism, while the similarities bring out the dynamics of ninth century Buddhism in East Asia as a whole.

As "nationalism" is usually regarded as being a much later product in world history dating from the eighteenth century, it is interesting to see examples of proto-nationalism in the ninth century. Very relevant here is the definition by Gellner who argues that "Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist."[299] The invention of legacy through lineage-making was probably the most notorious and yet creative feature of Chan Buddhism. The movement in this direction during the seventh to ninth centuries did not come into existence by itself alone, but was carried by a momentum from the social background. The acculturation of Buddhism, or a similar movement under a different name (such as the sinicisation of Buddhism) was the driving force of a transformation in East Asian Buddhism during this period, and Chan Buddhism was part and parcel of the mainstream.[300] This proposition is very similar to what Robert Buswell discovered about the

---

[299] Ernest Gellner (1964), *Thought and Change*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, p. 169.

[300] This tendency is seen in China in Huisi and Daoxuan's thought as discussed in Chapter Three, and in Daosui's teachings as discussed in Chapter Four. Japanese monks such as Dōji and Saichō also expressed a narrative of sense of legitimacy as illustrated in Chapter Five.

Vajrasamādhi Sūtra's relationship with the much wider trend of Chinese-derived Buddhism in Korea.[301] Seen from this aspect, it is inappropriate to regard the development of Chan Buddhism as coming from a self-conscious core. Rather, it is better to understand it as a response to a wider social and political environment.

A concern about one's own state, and dynasty, was communicated through East Asian Buddhism on a cross-cultural scale. The monarchical system together with political censorship penetrated the production of Buddhist discourses such as the lineality of Chan lineages and the charisma of Bodhisattva kings, which all served to promote stable kingship. Buddhist monks lived in institutions like monasteries that were unavoidably subject to state censorship, and Buddhist discourses were developed in every aspect with the purpose of attracting followers and patrons. Meanwhile, by the same token, their self-image began to be depicted in these discourses. The relation between national myth and nationalism in Japan in the eighteenth century has already been studied under the category of identity studies as a modern academic discipline. In the ninth century, however, a similar but looser identity construction had already begun and is a striking feature of that time. Just as a Meiji polemicist would adopt syncretic approaches and use his imagination for the restoration of the past to construct a collective identity, so too can a similar rhetoric be found among ninth century Buddhists.[302] All these syncretistic doctrines hinge on the relationship between religion and governance,

---

[301] Buswell, Robert E. (1989), *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi Sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon.* (Princeton Library of Asian Translations), NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

[302] A distinguished case study of the collective identity of Japan can be found in Ernst B. Haas (1997), *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress*, vol. 1 (2 vols), Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Chapter 7.

between the diverse substantive rationalities of religious legitimation and a rationality requiring uniformity of worldview. In the writings on Chan Buddhism selected in this chapter, a prominent feature is that the agenda outweighs the doctrine, and this implies a key attribute of early Chan Buddhism: its function of persuasion in building up the collective identity through a Buddhist worldview.

The whole process of identity construction, which was in fact a process of rationalisation, took place as a competition between different strands of Buddhist and non-Buddhist groups. An ideology of collective identity needs to be accepted by its audience. During the formation stage, the task for the authors of the ideology and the discourse is to gain acceptance and consensus among its readers, including the aristocracy and the rulers. As we will see in this chapter, Japanese Buddhism in the same period illustrates continuing strife among rival ideologies claiming contrasting missions and different institutions, and the situation was very similar to that of Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn in the Silla Kingdom. The task which fell on these writers, all speaking on behalf of Buddhism was to conceive a recognizable worldview for their dynasty and their own tradition. As the development of adept Buddhist discourses moved forward, there emerged the ambition of taking over China's central position through the adoption of Chan Buddhism. To appraise the significance of this discourse, we examine here two Buddhist writings, as case studies, against the broader background of ninth century East Asian Buddhism. Of these texts, one is by a Japanese monk named Kōjō and the other is by the Korean intellectual Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn. Kōjō's treatise represented a typical mode of persuasion towards the court, and Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's epitaphs can be understood as a challenge to China's central position in the Buddhist world. By comparing the two writers, I hope to illustrate the process of

the construction of cultural identity through Chan Buddhism beginning from China and then spreading to Japan and Korea.

1. Kōjō 光定 (779–858) and Heian Japan

There were competing Buddhist ideologies in early Heian Japan. The competition between the Sanron and the Hossō groups was fierce during early Heian, and Emperor Kanmu (r. 782-806) attempted to balance the two sects by encouraging Buddhist monks to learn Sanron teachings.[303] It was apparently as a response to the competition between the Nara sects that the Tendai founder Saichō raised a criticism of the six Nara sects in his proposal, *Shōnittō shōyakuhyō* (請入唐請益表), that he should go to study in Tang China. Saichō first denigrated the śāstra-centred Sanron and Hossō schools. By insisting on the higher status of sūtras over śāstras, the Tendai School was elevated over both Sanron and Hossō. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Saichō seems to have followed the thought of Huisi for the battles against scholasticism in Buddhist circles. He probably found that Tiantai Patriarch Huisi was in a similar situation to his, in that they both faced opponents from exegetic traditions based on the use of śāstras. Kūkai, a contemporary of Saichō, also endeavoured to construct a new type of Buddhist discourse to defeat scholasticism by focusing on ritual practices in his own

[303] Jinhua Chen (1999), *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography*. Tokyo, International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies), pp. 121 -126. The study of internal divisions in Nara Buddhism before this time is a subject in its own right which cannot be pursued here.

commentaries.[304] This may be seen as a process of rationalisation which took place as a competition between different strands of Buddhist groups. The task which fell to Buddhist polemicists was to conceive a recognizable worldview to gain acceptance and consensus among the rulers, and to support the emerging ambition of replacing China's central position Chan Buddhism was highlighted in the battle against competing scholasticisms. Kōjō was one of Saichō's most important disciples, especially in his role as a messenger between the court and Hieizan. Therefore, his agenda can be regarded as a continuation of Saichō's own, with renovations and reflections from his own time.

2. The *Denjutsu isshin kaimon*

Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshin kaimon* 傳述一心戒文 (T 74, No. 2379: 634b – 659a), written in 834, incorporated different elements in his discourse:

1) Discourse on the ascetic power arising out of meditation. (T74: 645c, 647a)
2) Discourse on the bodhisattva precepts in relation to bodhisattva monk Bodhidharma. (T74: 642b, 643b, 644c, 647a, 655c)
3) Discourse on the lineages monolithically transmitted from Bodhidharma. (T74: 645b, 652b, 652c)
4) The reincarnation story of Shōtoku Taishi. (T74: 639b-c, 647c, 652a, 653a-c, 654c)

[304] Ryūichi Abé (2007), "Scholasticism, Exegesis, and Ritual Practice: On renovation in the History of Buddhist Writing in the Early Heian Period", in Mikael Adolphson, Edward Kamens, and Stacie Matsumoto, eds., *Heian Japan, Centre and Peripheries*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'I Press, 2007, pp. 179-211.

In Kōjō's writings, these discourses were interwoven with each other in order to formulate the most appealing type of Buddhism for all. Targeting the emperors as the audience, Kōjō's writings are full of persuasive arguments. The first noticeable enticement is the imaginative projection of the supernatural power of Buddhist practitioners. Buddhist ascetic power has claimed attention since the inception of Buddhism. Ascetic power was believed to come from the diligent practice of meditation, as well as from adherence to *vinaya* giving the potency possessed by a purified practitioner. Meanwhile, just as Saichō took up Huisi's arguments (see Chapter Four), anti-scholasticism in Japan strengthened an emphasis on the "real practice" of Buddhism. These motivations taken together supplied multiple impetuses for the rise of Chan ideals in coalition with the increasing prominence of Bodhisattva precepts, which was similar to the pattern of Chan Buddhism in China as it existed at the time.

The ascetic model was then combined with the attraction of Mahāyāna Buddhism which lay in the idea that all people were to become members of the divinely blessed family, and not just a favoured few. The bodhisattva ideal in Mahāyāna Buddhism was also beneficial in providing an imaginative vision of political charisma. Kōjō promoted the bodhisattva precepts based on the *Brahmā's Net Sutra* and called it the "One-Minded Precept" (*isshinkai*). In fact, it seems that Kōjō's efforts to promoting the bodhisattva precepts received imperial recognition, judging from the evidence that Emperor Saga (786-842) carefully produced *Kōjō kaichō* (光定戒牒) in 823 A.D. for Kōjō, for the first imperial ceremony of bodhisattva precepts conferral in Japan. In a passage in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, Kōjō says:

> "What is the treasure of the nation? One treasure is the mind of the Way, and where there is the mind of the Way this may be called the treasure of the nation. People of old said: Something with a diameter of only ten *mei* is not a treasure for the nation, but if it illumines corners all around then it is treasure for the nation."[305]

This simple and even somewhat repetitive narrative emphasises the importance of the Buddhist mind, the "mind of the Way" which is so honourable that it amounts to a national treasure. It conveys a vision of making Japan a Buddhist centre with a remarkably virtuous mind. At this point, the treatise manifests a strong sense of legitimacy.

Kōjō's mention of Bodhidharma is always linked to the authority of Bodhisattva precepts. Kōjō's attempt to establish the legitimacy of the Bodhisattva precepts is inherited from Saichō's advocacy of the one-vehicle teaching. Bodhidharma is introduced as a "Bodhisattva monk" (Ch. *pusaseng*, Jp. *Bosatsusō* 菩薩僧) and therefore the model for the ordinations of other Bodhisattva monks.[306] (T74: 642b-643b) He claimed that the "one-vehicle

---

[305] T 74: 651a. (國寶何物，寶道心是也，有道心，名為國寶。故古人言，徑寸十枚，非是國寶，照千一隅，此則國寶。) This concept of "national treasure" existed in Buddhist and Daoist contexts, but it was particularly emphasised in Tiantai and Tendai tradition. See Anna Seidel (1981), "Kokuhō: note à propos du terme 'trésor national' en Chine et au Japon", *BEFEO* (*Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient*) 69, p. 229-261.

[306] The Northern Zhou (557-581) institution of "Bodhisattva monks" in China refers to the category of monks who left their heads unshaven, and it indicates difficulties in the provision of proper ordination. This idea reached Nara Japan in the form of the acceptance of *bosatsusō*, which refers to the monks who did not receive full ordination, eg. Gyōgi 行基 (668-749). See Jinhua Chen (2002),

ordination certificate" (*ichijō kaichō* 一乗戒牒) had the precedent of Chinese Emperor Wu of the Liang's approval of Bodhidharma, and so it should be likewise with the Japanese Emperor Saga's valuing of the "one-vehicle ordination certificate". (T74: 655c)

Kōjō spent quite a lengthy portion of his text weaving Bodhidharma into the wider context, linking together all the elements of Bodhidharma, the one-vehicle precepts (based on the *Brahmā's Net Sutra*, Jp. *Bonmōkyō*), and past examples of imperial patronage. The Chinese Emperor Wu of Liang was also mentioned as evidence of Bodhidharma's attractiveness as a meditation master. According to Kōjō, the most important teaching brought to China by Bodhidharma was the one-vehicle precept. Moreover, according to him, this transmission of "the Bodhisattva precepts of the perfect teaching" (圓教菩薩戒) was first pursued by Saichō for the sake of state-protection.[307]

Bodhidharma's transmission of the Bodhisattva precepts constitutes the main notion of "lineage" in Kōjō's writings. For him, Bodhidharma is the twenty-eighth Indian patriarch of the transmission of "one-vehicle precepts" (*ichijōkai*). (T74: 652b) When the "one-vehicle precepts" were introduced to China, the first Chinese patriarch to whom they were entrusted was Huisi, who purportedly

"*Pusaseng* (bodhisattva-monks): A Peculiar Monastic Institution at the Turn of the Northern Zhou (557-581) and Sui (581-618) Dynasties", *Journal of Chinese Religions* 30 (2002), pp. 1-22, especially p. 19. Cf. Bowring (2005:86-88) "The question of ordination".

[307] "Relying on the power of Buddhist precepts in protecting the state and safeguarding households." (求戒之力，護國保家.) T74: 655a. Cf. Chapter Four for the function of Bodhisattva precepts at the service of the court.

received the precepts from the Buddha at Vulture Peak (Jp. Ryōzen 靈山, "Spiritual Mountain") through visionary experience.[308] This was claimed as a direct lineage from Śākyamuni to Huisi. Huisi then transmitted the precepts to Zhiyi, who conferred the "one-vehicle precepts" to Chinese emperors during the Sui Dynasty. (T74: 645b) On the other hand, Bodhidharma was also of the "*Laṅkā-Dharma*" (楞伽法) lineage, which was later transmitted to other *Chan* masters, including Daoxin and Shenxiu. (T74: 652c) Kōjō combines miscellaneous implications of Bodhidharma's image for establishing the legitimacy of the "one-vehicle precepts", and what made the figure of Bodhidharma irreplaceable was his monolithic lineage as well as the newly imposed identity of "Bodhisattva monk".

Relying on the legitimacy of Bodhidharma, Kōjō relentlessly expounds further the reincarnation story of Shōtoku Taishi from Chinese master Huisi, and then the meeting between Shōtoku Taishi and Bodhidharma. As William Bodiford noticed, this fabrication including Bodhidharma was started by Kōjō, not by Saichō.[309] Kōjō and his master Saichō appropriated this legend for the reshaping of Tendai's self-definition in Japan, for it expedited the promotion of the Tendai

---

[308] Nobuyoshi Yamabe's study on the visionary elements in Buddhist precepts suggests that the origin of visionary ordination was connected with visionary repentance and was widely accepted because of the popularity of the *Brahma Net Sūtra* in China. Nobuyoshi Yamabe (2005), "Visionary Repetance and Visionary Ordination in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*", in William Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth,* pp. 17-39.

[309] William Bodiford (2005), "Bodhidharma's Precepts in Japan", in Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 185 – 209.

School by linking it to the Japanese Prince.[310] The reincarnation of Shōtoku Taishi vindicated the idea that the Tendai tradition should be in the centre of Japanese Buddhism. At the same time their interpretation stands for a new apprehension of Japan's position within the Buddhist world. This reincarnation story seemed to be widely accepted by both Chinese and Japanese Buddhists and facilitated Sino-Japan Buddhist interaction. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this narrative also serves to create a direct link to the Buddhist origins in India.[311] By stating that Japan's Tendai originated from Master Huisi, who was even earlier than the celebrated Master Zhiyi, Saichō could claim that Japan was not inferior to China.[312] The reincarnation story presents a centre-periphery concept for Sino-Japan relations within the Buddhist tradition. It shows that Japanese monks had considered their own position in relation to China. Japanese monks were more than imitators or receivers of their Chinese fellows.

In the myth invention and identity construction process, Kōjō took a syncretistic approach and created reciprocal possibilities of political bargaining. As manifested in his commentary, it is quite natural that the growth of sense of

---

[310] Michael Como also notices that Japanese Buddhist apologists up to Saichō have put Shōtoku Taishi at the centre in building up the Tendai tradition and its self-definition. See Michael Como (2008), *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 133- 153.

[311] Como (2008: 151); T. H. Barrett (2009) "Rebirth from China to Japan in Nara Hagiography: A Reconsideration", in *Buddhist Studies Review* 26.1 (2009).

[312] About Japan's position in Saichō's mind, some scholars have different views. Como notices Saichō's concern in placing Tendai in the centre of Japanese Buddhism by linking itself to India. In Jinhua Chen's (1999: 137, 140) study on the *Ehyō Tendai shū*, he argues that Saichō attempted to argue that China had superseded India in terms of Buddhist development.

legitimacy should rely on Buddhist imagination, especially at a time when the boundary between religious and political spheres was quite loose. At this period in time imagination played an important part in the sense of community, and, not unnaturally, religious writing and supernatural human figures provide ample resources for the imagination. The function of Buddhist commentaries, legends and hagiography are to enrich the imagination of the intended audience. As Benedict Anderson insightfully remarks, "In fact, all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact are imagined. Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but the style in which they are imagined."[313] Imagination was the most crucial tool for collective identity construction at various levels, from a nation to a Buddhist community. The sense of community in Buddhism such as is found in the Chan concept of lineage is recognised by now to be full of imagination.

In the case of Japan, since the eighteenth century, national myth was designed to result in a core of ideas and claims about a commonly accepted national selfhood. The national myth represents those ideas, values, and symbols that most citizens accept despite their being divided into competing ideological groups. The myth represents the overlap among ideologies. This approach, however, was not new, and in both eras it was manipulated from the top. Kōjō and Saichō, and probably also their predecessors, had targeted the court as their reader. There was collaboration, throughout the layers of authorship, to use Buddhist legends as a means to locate Japan at the centre.

---

[313] Benedict Anderson (1983), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* London Verso Editions and NLB. p. 15.

There was clearly a connection between the monarchy system and the monolithic Zen lineage, and it implies a centre-periphery oriented cosmology. Monarchy was meant to maintain political stability and the Zen lineage was assimilated to the contemporary political system. If Chan Buddhism could provide any useful ideology for the rulers, its monolithic lineage was probably the most obvious one.[314] Descending from several Indian patriarchs, the monolithic lineage then starts a Chinese line from Bodhidharma, who was always referred to as the ideal bodhisattva-monk. The most righteous and legitimate Buddhist transmission would be at the virtuous centre of Buddhism, shining upon other adjacent countries. Under this logic, it is understandable that people liked the idea that Bodhidharma directly transmitted Buddhism to Japan. This explains Kōjō's invention of Bodhidharma's visit to Japan, added on to the already existent legend of Shōtoku Taishi as the reincarnation of the Chinese Tiantai Patriarch Huisi, who was admired as having compassion to spread Buddhism to a non-Buddhist land.

3. Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn 崔致遠 (b. 857) and Korea

Similar to the competition between the Sanron and the Hossō in early Heian Japan, there were competing ideologies in the Silla Kingdom 新羅 (57 B.C.E.- 935). At the earliest stage, Sŏn (Chan) masters had to compete with the Hwaŏm (Huayan) School, which was long entrenched at the seat of government in Kyŏngju. Despite the political disarray in the capital, the Hwaŏm remained a

314 The similarities were first noticed by Ōta Teizō 太田悌蔵 (1956), "Dentō, dōtō, kōtō"伝灯・道統・皇統, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 7 (4-1), pp. 67-70.

potent force, providing continued ideological support to the centralised Silla autocracy and nobility. The writings of the founders of early Sŏn sects, such as Toŭi 道義 (d. 825) and Muyŏm 無染 (799-888), testify to the ideological battles between Sŏn and Hwaŏm. The debate between proponents of doctrinal studies and diligent practitioners was analogous to that which occurred in sixth century China during Huisi's time.[315] At a time of persistent ideological combat, Silla Buddhism appeared to be a syncretic and "ecumenical" tradition, and was traditionally referred to as *t'ong pulgyo* (通仏教) or "comprehensive Buddhism".[316] Extant works written during the early decades of the United Silla dynasty (668 – 935) show that contemporaries including the famous Wŏnhyo 元曉 (617 – 686) were actively exploring the whole gamut of Buddhism, from Mādhyamika to Yogācāra to Pure Land, and attempting to integrate these traditions into an all-inclusive perspective on Buddhist thought and practice. In

[315] Cf. Chapter Two about the rise of Chan Buddhism in China. For the tension and interaction between Sŏn and Hwaŏm during the introduction of Sŏn, see Ch'oe Pyŏnghŏn 崔柄憲 (1976), "Silla hadae Sŏnjong Kusanp'a ŭi sŏngnip: Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn ŭi sasan pimyŏng ŭl chungsim ŭro" 新羅下代禪宗九山派의成立 : 崔致遠의四山碑銘을中心으로 (The establishment of the Nine Mountains Sŏn lineage during the latter Silla, focusing on Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's stelae inscriptions from four mountains), in *Han'guk sa nonmun sŏnjip* (*Kodae p'yŏn*) 韓國史論文選集(古代篇) (Essay-collection on Korean History: Ancient Period), vol. 2, edited by Yŏksa hakkoe 歷史學會, Seoul: Ilchogak. , pp. 265-321. The author regards the rise of early Sŏn as a reaction against "scholastic Buddhism" (教學佛教), see pp. 268-278.

[316] However, we are aware that this conception of Korean Buddhism has been criticised by a younger generation of scholars, both Korean and westerners, during the last two decades or so, mainly because the notion was a modern response to the influence of Japanese Buddhism in the colonial period.

his commentary *Kŭmgang sammaegyŏng-ron* (金剛三昧經論), Wŏnhyo states that his intent is to harmonise all the variant descriptions in Buddhist texts that threatened and obscured the fundamental message and to present the "consummate sound" (*wŏnsŏng*, Ch. *Yuansheng* 圓聲). Wŏnhyo and his contemporaries mistook the doctrinal teachings of the *Vajrasamādhi Sūtra* as coming directly from India; nevertheless, one of the major agenda of the *Vajrasasmādhi* was from the indigenous Chan movement within Chinese Buddhism, which demonstrated a strong cultural identity. In his research into the authorship of the *Vajrasamādhi*, Buswell (1989: 122) regards the agenda of the Chan movement as the sinicisation of meditation, which was just making its way to Korea. In both China and Korea, meditation in particular came within the purview of the process of sinicisation. Scholars have tended to forget this broader context when discussing a "distinguishable" Chan School. Yet the legends of Chan's putative founder, Bodhidharma, hardly suggested a school isolated from the mainstream of Chinese Buddhism. The separation of sects is determined by a political agenda regarding the centre-periphery relationship, as the following primary source will display. The superimposed differences between factions of Chan masters appear to have had differences not in meaning, but only in phraseology.

The early introduction of Chan Buddhism in the Silla Dynasty took place from the sixth century to the eighth century, but it was not until the ninth century that Korean monks returned from China to Silla and the Nine Mountains

of Sŏn (*Kusan Sŏnmun* 九山禪門) were founded.[317] (Buswell, 1989: 164) Important figures at the introduction stage include Pŏbrang 法朗 (d.u.) who studied with the fourth Chan patriarch Daoxin, and Pŏbrang's student Sinhaeng 愼行 (704-779). As another line of transmission, Mazu's Chan teaching was introduced by student monks who studied under Zhizang 智藏, a dharma heir of Mazu. Three of Zhizang's students became the founders of the Nine Mountains of Sŏn. This record shows that Zhizang had a great influence on the formation of Chan in Silla at the initial stage. Another important Silla monk is Musang 無相 (680-756), the founder of the Jingzhong Monastery 靜衆寺. According to his biography (T50: 823b-833a), Musang arrived in Chang'an in 728 and later he met Chuji 處寂 (669-736), a Chan master who had allegedly received the robe of the sixth Chan patriarch Huineng. After receiving Chuji's dharma transmission, Musang was even invited to court in Chengdu by Emperor Xuanzong 玄宗 (r.712-756).

The earliest sources for Korean Chan/Sŏn Buddhism, dating from the ninth century, are a few inscriptions honouring the subsequent founders of the Nine Mountain of Sŏn. Four of these inscriptions were written by Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn

[317] The Nine Mountains of Sŏn were founded over a period of one hundred years from the late Silla period onwards. Each of the Nine Schools takes its name from the mountain on which its central monastery is located: Kaji san 迦智山, founded by Toŭi (d. 825); Silsang san 實相山, founded by Hongch'ŏk 洪陟(fl.826); Tongni san 桐裡山, founded by Hyech'ŏl 惠徹 (785–861); Sagŭl san 闍崛山, founded by Pŏmil 梵日 (810–889); Pongnim san 鳳林山, founded by Hyŏnuk 玄昱 (787–869); Sajasan 獅子山, founded by Toyun 道允 (797–868); Hŭiyang san 曦陽山, founded by Tohŏn 道憲 (824–882); Sŏngju san 聖住山, founded by Muyŏm; and Sumi san 須彌山, founded by Iŏm 利嚴 (869–936).

崔致遠 (b. 857), who was one of the earliest and finest writers of the Silla period and held important posts in the Tang bureaucracy before returning to Silla in 885.[318]

Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's unique career provided him with opportunities for a deep study of both Chinese and Korean, which also make his writings very important to us. Born into an elite family in Kyŏngju, Ch'oe had two brothers, one of whom was a monk. At the age of twelve, he came to Tang China to study with his father's warning that "If you don't pass the examination in ten years, you are not my son." Compared to the other Korean pupils who were sponsored by the Silla court to study in China, Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn was far more diligent and determined.[319] In 874 A.D., he passed the examination for non-Chinese students (*bin'gongshi* 賓貢試).[320] In order to prepare for a higher examination in literature,

---

[318] Ch'oe Pyŏnghŏn (1976: 267-79); John Jorgensen (2005), *Inventing Hui-neng, the Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch'an*, Leiden & Boston : Brill, pp. 723-4. Ch'oe Yŏngsŏng 崔英成 (1987), *Chuhae Sasan pimyŏng* 註解四山碑銘, Asea munhwasa: Seoul, pp. 1-27; Ch'oe Yŏngsŏng (1990), *Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn ŭi sasang yŏn'gu: purok: Sasan pimyŏng chipju* 崔致遠의 思想研究 附錄、四山碑銘集註. Asea munhwasa: Seoul; Yi Usŏng 李佑成 (1995), collator and trans., *Silla Sasan pimyŏng* 新羅四山碑銘, Asea munhwasa: Seoul, preface.

[319] Takemura Noriyuki 竹村則行 (2003), "Shinragi Sai Chien to Bantō Ko Yun no kōyū ni tsuite" 新羅・崔致遠と晩唐・顧雲の交遊について (On the Friendship between Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn of Silla and Gu Yun of the Late Tang period), *Studies in literature* (*Bungaku kenkyū* 文學研究) 100, Departmental Bulletin Paper, Faculty of Humanities, Kyushu University, pp. 27-50, especially p. 28-35 for the background of Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn and his contemporaries in Tang China.

[320] A great number of Korean and Japanese students came to study in China in order to pass this examination during the Tang Dynasty. Their cultural identities show acceptance of Chinese centre-periphery world view on one hand and

he resigned his post and became a hermit in the mountains. Because of the breadth of his literary talents, he again took office around 880 A.D., during the disastrous Huangchao Rebellion (黃巢之亂, 874-884). For the documents and decrees he wrote, he was awarded a position of Attendant at Court in 884 A.D. When he met the Tang Emperor Xizong (唐熹宗, r. 873-888) at the court, he was promoted as an emissary of the Tang court to convey formal greetings to the Silla court. In 885 A.D., he finally returned to Silla after seventeen years' stay in China. At the Silla court, from 885 up to 898 A.D., he held a series of posts as a courtier-scholar. Jealousy and the competition of other officials forced him to become a district governor for a few years. Before long however, there was a rebellion which disturbed the power of the Silla court, and in 898 A.D. he resigned his post and retreated into the mountains. He stayed in various places including the famous Ssanggye Monastery (雙溪寺).[321] Then he ended up at Haein Monastery with his brother. Sometime later he died, but the date is unknown.

---

resistance towards Chinese cultural hegemony on the other hand. Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn and Abe no Nakamaro are two representatives, see Kawamoto Yoshiaki 川本 芳昭 (2003), "Sai Chien to Abe no Nakamaro—Kōdai Chōsen Nihon ni okeru *Chūgokuka* to no kanren kara mita" 崔致遠と阿倍仲麻呂--古代朝鮮・日本における「中国化」との関連から見た (On Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn and Abe no Nakamaro: The Aspect of the "Sinicisation" in Ancient Korea and Japan), *The Oriental Studies* (九州大学東洋史論集), No. 31 (2003.4), pp. 181 – 204.

[321] It was said that a Korean ruler sent a missionary to acquire the skull of the Sixth Chan Patriarch Huineng and stored it in the Ssanggye Monastery, but this story was rejected in the biography of Huineng in the Chinese lamp records, *Jingde chuandenglu*. (Ch'oe Pyŏnghŏn 1976: 280) It indicates the symbolic value of Patriarch Huineng during the initial stage of Sŏn Buddhism in Korea and his importance as a figure to the Silla ruling class.

Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn wrote three collections of poetry in different genres, a collection of memorials to the throne, two works of belles-lettres and an historical chronicle of the Silla that greatly influenced the *Samguk sagi* (三國史記, "Chronicles of the Three Kingdoms") by Kim Pusik 金富軾, the standard history of pre-Koryŏ Korea. Most of these are not preserved in the Korean and Chinese resources, only the *Kyewŏn P'ilgyŏng* (桂苑筆耕, "Collection on Ploughing a Cassia Grove with a Writing Brush") in twenty fascicles is preserved, plus a few poems in the *Tongmun sŏn* (東文選, "Anthology of Eastern [i.e. Korean] Literature"). The main source we use here is the *Sasan pimyŏng* (四山碑銘, "Four-Mountain Steles"), a collection of four Buddhist inscriptions, which were all extracted by the *Kyewŏn P'ilgyŏng*. The collection of *Sasan pimyŏng* includes three obituaries for monks and one inscription for the establishment of a monastery. These inscriptions remain the principle documents of early Sŏn Buddhism. The ties between the earliest Korean and Chinese Chan masters were interwoven with the introduction of Sŏn Buddhism. Those Korean monks who spent time in the Chinese monasteries of the founding masters of Chinese schools at times became leaders themselves.

4. The "Four mountain steles" (*Sasan pi'myŏng*)

The surviving stele engravings referred to collectively as the *Sasan pi'myŏng* are as follows:

1. “Memorial Stele for Priest Chingam of Ssanggye Temple” (*Ssanggyesa Chingam pi’myŏng* 雙溪寺眞鑒碑銘), 887 A.D., at Ssanggye Temple, Kyŏngsannamdo.[322]
2. “Stele of Taesungbok Temple” (*Taesungpoksa pi’myŏng* 大崇福寺碑銘), 885 A.D., Kyŏngju (not entirely preserved).
3. “Memorial Stele for Priest Ranghye of Sŏngju Temple” (*Sŏngjusa Ranghye hwasang pi’myŏng* 聖住寺朗慧和尙碑銘), 890 A.D., at Sŏngju Temple, Ch’ungch’ŏngnamdo.[323]
4. “Memorial Stele for Priest Chijŭng of Pong’am Temple” (*Pong’amsa Chijŭng taesa pi’myŏng* 鳳巖寺智證大師碑銘), 893 A.D. (engraved in 924 A.D.), at Mun’gyŏng, Kyŏngsanbukdo.[324]

Ch’oe shows his sense of legitimacy in the inscription for Chingam 眞鑒 (755 - 850), who visited China during 804 – 830. The very first line in this inscription runs: “The Way is not distant from human beings and human beings are not to be differentiated by countries.” (道不遠人, 人無異國.) The first part of this sentence is a quotation from the Confucian Classic “The Mean” (Ch. *Zhongyong*, 中庸), and this is then expanded into the concept of a universal Way which transcends national borders. Thus adducing the high culture of China itself to assert equality between China and Silla, he then began to elaborate further on the necessity of Master Chingam’s visit to China:

[322] In *Tangwen shiyi* (唐文拾遺) 44, collected in the final volume of *Quan Tang Wen,* volume11, pp. 10864 – 7 ; *Chŏsen kinseki sŏran* 朝鮮金石總覽, Chŏsen Sŏtokufu 朝鮮總督府. V. 1, no. 33, pp. 66 - 72.

[323] *Tangwen shiyi* 44: 10867 – 73; *Chŏsen kinseki sŏran* ,V. 1, no.34, pp. 72-83.

[324] *Tangwen shiyi* 44: 10874 – 8.

> Those who search for pearls do not withdraw from steep cliffs…thereby they would attain the torch of wisdom… It enables a country to strengthen benevolence. In so doing they spread the wonderful Way to distant places and widely spread the glory of our country.[325]

Stressed here is the tremendous difficulty for those who searched for the Dharma in China and at the same time its value to the people of the whole country. Considering the personal background, Ch'oe himself studied in China for many years, so it is understandable that he emphasised this legitimisation, especially when the purpose of travelling afar for learning was to honour one's home town as a loyal and patriotic person. A strong sense of Confucian piety is expressed in such a statement. When it came to the level of sense of legitimacy however, Ch'oe adopted a syncretistic approach to political bargaining in order to solve the conflict between Confucianism and Buddhism:

> The offspring of the people of the east may follow either Śākyamuni or Confucius. …For this reason, Huiyuan of Mt. Lu composed a commentary as follows: if we speak of *Tathāgata* [Buddha] in comparison with Lord Zhou and Confucius, even though they had different origins, they share the same destiny.[326]

---

[325] (探珠者不辭驪壑之深… 遂得慧炬… 能令一國興仁… 遠傳妙道，廣耀吾鄉) Ibid, p. 10864b.

[326] (東人之子，為釋為儒。…故廬峰慧遠著論，謂如來之與周孔，發致雖殊，所歸一揆。) Ibid, p. 10864b.

Faced with competing ideological groups, syncretism as espoused by Ch'oe and his numerous predecessors seemed to be the best solution. He dealt likewise with the competing Chan groups. In the epitaph for Ranghye 朗慧 (800-888), Ch'oe was aware of different opinions about meditation traditions and argued against divisions between them by stating that the most important virtue of a practitioner is to practise diligently. He writes,

> Some say that doctrines and meditation have nothing in common, but I do not see the point of this. We cannot know all the fine depths of language. To make extensive comparisons of similarities and differences is a far cry from peaceful sitting and breathing. How could it have anything to do with those who wear threadbare woollen garments? ... If recourse to forms becomes formless, and the followers of the Way practise it diligently, there will be no more seeing disparities within disparities.[327]

This argument corresponds to the tendency to aim at eliminating the gap between scholasticism and meditation. Ch'oe's standpoint is close to Zongmi's approach, which could be regarded as an attempt to restore harmony between existent tensions. The debates between differences in Chan Buddhism were still on-going issues during the ninth century, and these syncretistic doctrines rest on the relationship between religion and governance and between the diverse rationalities of religious legitimation. In dealing with the competition between Chan lineages however, Ch'oe took a different strategy. Ideologies could be

[327] (或謂教禪為無同, 吾未見其宗, 語本夥頤, 非吾所知, 大較同弗與異弗, 非宴坐息機, 斯近縷褐被者歟。… 使尋相為無相, 道者勤而行之, 不見有歧中之歧。) Ibid, p.10872b.

amended and blended, but a lineage must be certain and assured since the monarch was the only king in any one country.

In Choe's inscription for Chijŭng 智證 (824–882), also known as Chisŏn Tohŏn 智詵道憲, Ch'oe accordingly made definite separations for the Chan lineages and emphasized the direct line of Xitang Zhizang 西堂智藏 (735-814).[328] Xitang had particularly good connections with Korean monks. Among the founders of the nine schools, Chijŭng's Hŭiyang san School is generally regarded as the oldest of the Nine Mountains Schools. Apart from Chijŭng, three claimed to have learned from Xitang: Toŭi of the Gajisan, Hongch'ŏk of the Silsang san, and Hyech'ŏl of the Tongni san.[329] In contrast to various Chan traditions in the epitaph for Chingam, such as the Chinese Sixth Patriarch Huineng 會能 (638 –

[328] Xitang was the most important disciple of Mazu Daoyi (709-788) and succeeded to leadership of the monastery left by Mazu. Xitang travelled widely and visited some other famous masters, such as Nanyang Huizhong 南陽慧忠 (677-775), and the Oxhead school's Jingshan Faqin 徑山法欽 (714-792). The recognition of his inheritance of Mazu is spelled out by the famous Tang writer Li Shangyin 李商隱 (c.818 - c.858). His *Tang Zizhou Huiyi jingshe Nanchanyuan Sizhengtang beiming* 唐梓州慧義精舍南禪院四證堂碑銘 stresses the "southern" tradition of Huineng. (*Quan Tang Wen xinbian* 全唐文新編 780: 9291-93) On the other hand, another group of monks claim that Xingshan Weikuan 興善惟寬 (755-817) received the highest teachings from Mazu and was active in the North, as is written in Bai Juyi's *Xijing Xingshansi Chuanfatan beiming* 西京興善寺傳法堂碑銘.(*Quan Tang Wen* 678: 62a) As Ishii Shūdō concludes, the relationship between Xingshan and Xitang is analogous to the North-South division between Huineng and Shenxiu. See his "Kōshūshū ni okeru Seidō Chizō no ichi ni tsuite" 洪州宗における西堂智蔵の位置について, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 53 (27-1), 1978, pp. 280-84, especially p.283.

[329] In assessing Xitang's influence in Korea, Ishii only mentions three founders who learned from Xitang, but Chijŭng is not included. (Ibid, p. 284)

713), Shenxiu 神秀 (606 – 706), and Sengchou 僧稠 (480 – 560), Ch'oe emphasises Chijŭng's single transmission from Xitang. This contrast shows a strong sense of a definite lineage from Xitang which was mentioned under the label of the "Chan" school in full awareness of the disputation between different factions in Silla.[330]

The Korean tradition credits the Silla monk Pŏmnang (Ch. Falang 法朗, d.u.) with the first introduction of Chan Buddhism from China, and the pre-eminent source for this account is the inscription written by Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn for Chijŭng. Pŏmnang travelled to China during the reign of Silla Queen Sŏndŏk 善德 (r. 632-646) and studied under the fourth Chinese patriarch Daoxin 道信 (580-651). Strangely enough, this inscription written by Ch'oe provides little evidence that he knew anything about Pŏmnang at all. Unfortunately he remains an enigmatic figure, though ubiquitous in early Sŏn traditions. The difficulties Pŏmnang faced in his career of preaching Chan Buddhism, as described by Ch'oe, are fairly common in other hagiographies. Similarities can be found in Bodhidharma's biography concerning the disputations between exegetic monks

---

[330] So Ch'oe writes: "the schools of teaching began to split from this time on." (…教門從此分邪) （Ibid, p. 10877b.) The schism in China led to the multiplicity of different Sŏn branches in Silla, characterised by disparate doctrines and geographic locations. (靜眾無相、常山慧覺、禪譜益州金、鎮州金者，是東歸則前所敘北山義、南岳涉而佺之，大安徹國師、慧目育、智力聞、雙溪照、新興彥、涌巖體，珍丘休，雙峰雲、孤山日、兩朝國師聖住染。) (Ibid, p. 10874b.)

and meditation practitioners, and with opponents from other hostile groups.[331] Despite there not being much knowledge about Pŏmnang, Ch'oe demonstrates an attempt to establish the pedigree of the indigenous Korean Sŏn as descending directly from Daoxin. Ch'oe's method is not different from that of the accounts produced by the Chinese Oxhead School, which sought to establish a retrospective link between Daoxin and Farong 法融 (594-657).[332] What is different and inventive is the connection to the Korean master Pŏmnang, deliberately made here, which became the dominant account of the history of Sŏn in Korea. This could be one of the earliest accounts asserting that a Korean master joined the Chan lineage with a prestige equal to that of the Chinese patriarchs at a very early stage of Chan history.

In all the surviving epitaphs which he composed, Ch'oe Chiwŏn reflected the acculturation of Buddhism under a centre-periphery framework in East Asia. Ch'oe sums up Chingam's inscription by praising his achievement in meditation practice, mind discipline and maturity in bodhisattva-hood, and then the most important point is that he came back to Silla in order to cultivate not only Buddhism, but also culture in general. He writes, "[Master Chingam] Forbade speaking in meditation, he paid homage of his mind to the Buddha and his

---

[331] "The Continued Biography of Eminent Monks," T 50: 596c. See Chapter Two for discussion on the tension between exegetical monks and anti-scholasticism.

[332] John McRae's study on Oxhead demonstrates that the connection between Daoxin and Farong is fabricated because they never met each other. MacRae (1983), "The Ox-head School of Chinese Ch'an Buddhism: From Early Ch'an to the Golden Age", in Robert Gimello and Peter Gregory, eds., *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen,* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 169-252; see especially the part on these two patriarchs on pp. 180-196.

capacity matured as a bodhisattva… He went to transmit the esoteric seal and came to transform Silla."[333]

He elaborates this centre-periphery relationship between China and Silla at full length in a later inscription for Ranghye 朗慧 (800 – 888).[334] According to this epitaph for Ranghye, he was not only revered by the Silla aristocracy, but also admired by the famous Chinese poet Bo Juyi 白居易 (722 – 846). On the occasion of an extraordinary conversation, Bo Juyi was impressed by Ranghye's talent, and even embarrassed by the huge discrepancy between himself and this Korean monk. Out of amazement, Bo Juyi said to him:

> I have seen many people in my life, but seldom one like this man of Silla. One day in the future, if China should lose the transmission of Chan, should we then search for it among the people of the East?[335]

He then goes on to expand on the belief in a shift of the Buddhist centre to the East. Ch'oe's alleged quotation is taken from a prestigious Chinese monk

---

[333] (杜口禪那, 歸心佛陀, 根熟菩薩, …去傳密印, 來化新羅。) *Tangwen shiyi* 44: 10867a.

[334] In this epitaph, it is said that Ranghye was called the tenth Perfect-Enlightenment patriarch 圓覺祖師, and received the transmission from Fazang in a dream. His biography was full of magical stories: in his childhood he had extraordinary memory ability, and in adulthood, he once survived fatal danger in a sea trip.

[335] (吾閱人多矣, 罕有如是新羅子, 他日中國失禪, 將問之東夷耶) *Tangwen shiyi* 44: 10869b.

Magu Baoche 麻谷寶徹 (b.720?). In a visit to Baoche, Ranghye received instructions about Chan Buddhism. Out of admiration for Rangye's luminous comprehension of Chan Buddhism, Baoche recalled his own master Mazu. According to Baoche, Mazu made a remark about the rise of Buddhist intelligence in the East, where there would eventually arise a champion of Chan Buddhism.[336] Mazu even predicted that, as a monk of the Jiangxi region (江西大兒) in this life, he might be reborn as an eminent master in the East of the Sea. (海東大父) This account resonates with the reincarnation story of the Japanese Prince Shōtoku as mentioned above. There is a parallel in that, in both stories, the reincarnation figure in Japan or Korea is always set higher than the Chinese original. When Mazu's current life is a "grand son" (大兒) in China, his rebirth will be as a "grand father" (大父). Apparently "father" is superior to "son" in this context. Therefore the reincarnation in Japan or Korea superseded their Chinese precedent in becoming a great bodhisattva in the East (作東方大菩薩). Ch'oe then links this "prediction of Buddhism flowing eastward" (東流之說) to the cause of the Huichang persecution (會昌法難) in 845 A.D., which made Buddhists wonder about Chinese Buddhism in decline in the near future. Ch'oe held a post at the Silla court when this epitaph was written. By placing Korea higher than China, at the centre, he conveys his sense of legitimacy, as well as an intention to use Chan Buddhism to reverse the centre and the margin.

---

336 (俾冠禪侯於東土) Ibid: 10869b – 10870a.

There are parallels between Kōjō's and Ch'oe's writings. First of all, they both emphasised the ascetic power of meditation practitioners, which was a result of an image-making process during the rise of Chan Buddhism. The Chan/Sŏn patriarchs must demonstrate the potency of their meditation practice. In the meantime, the image of these Chan masters is supposed to illustrate the bodhisattva path in accordance with how both Ch'oe and Kōjō referred to them as bodhisattvas. Finally, these patriarchs must have a distinctive lineage, just as Ch'oe elaborated in each of the inscriptions. The most significant parallel between the two writers is the attempt to replace China as the central state of Buddhism, even though they spell it out in different ways and formats. For both of them, Chan Buddhism is useful in redefining the cultural hierarchy between themselves and China. Due to this characteristic of cross-cultural transmission of Buddhism, the mobility of patriarchs is extremely important. In this sense, Ch'oe and Kōjō saw Chan Buddhism as more than the lineages; rather, they regarded it as somehow equivalent to culture in a more general sense. These observations from the two writers bring out a fresh aspect of the shifting religion which is called Chan Buddhism.

Concluding Remarks

The sinicisation of Buddhism implies a process of identity construction to place China in the centre again. Culture and religion joined together in this process, first in China and then in Korea. It was probably because of the inseparable connections in the internal ontology of Buddhism that we see examples of changes occurring in China soon having an impact on Korea and

Japan; and vice versa. On the other hand, the location of centrality or marginality was not fixed in their ontology. Rather, innovative Buddhist intellects such as Kōjō and Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn ventured to create a reversal of centre and margin.

With the texts discussed above, we discovered a mechanism: cultural identity hinged on a syncretistic rationalisation formula chosen by the elites, and on the adaptations involved. This mechanism existed in both modern and pre-modern East Asia. We also see an East Asian version of a liberal national myth and the institutionalisation of diffuse reciprocity in political bargaining. The approach was called "restorationism", that is, restoration of a presumed past, which is a form of traditional-syncretistic proto-nationalism. Nation-state building began from a much later period in the eighteenth century, but the consciousness of selfhood had emerged through Buddhist discourses much earlier, from the eighth and ninth centuries.

In the writings of both Kōjō and Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn, the self-image was projected with the aim of replacing China as the central state in the Buddhist world. In Kōjō's writing, the myth of Bodhidharma and Shōtoku Taishi came to be promoted as a dominant theme. It provided a helpful ideology for sense of legitimacy and cultural identity. This text discloses the competition of that period concerning religious discourses in political bargaining. In Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's inscriptions, an attempt to supersede China through Chan Buddhism is conspicuous. Just as with Kōjō, this discourse provided a helpful ideology for sense of legitimacy and cultural identity. We have illustrated here the birth and dissemination process of an idea which had the potential to become an ideology. The idea taken from Chan Buddhism formed the worldview of contemporaneous elites, and it framed the primitive international relations of ninth century East Asia.

The aspects of Chan Buddhism that Ch'oe and Kōjō's perceptions bring out are consistent with the strand of thought discussed in previous chapters. Their definition of *Chan* is inseparable from the distinction between practice and teaching. An increased emphasis on the bodhisattva mind is integrated into the image of meditation masters. Even their attempt to replace the central position of China is fundamentally the same as the sinicisation of Buddhism in China proper. The only difference lies in the discourse regarding the "Dharma moved east", which was stressed more in Japan and Korea. It illustrates the feature of a shifting Buddhism in East Asia. In the context of the cross-border transmission of Buddhism, the mobility of "patriarchs" was essential in maintaining the legitimacy and continuity. This characteristic of the mobility of patriarchs is seen in Bodhidharma, Huisi, Prince Shōtoku, Chingam, Ranghye and Chijŭng.

Conclusion

Chan Buddhism: A Mobile Religion

This research project reassesses the important, but also highly controversial, matter of how ninth century *Chan* Buddhism is understood in contemporary theory, and proposes new solutions. In spite of the excellence of much recent scholarship focusing on particular aspects of Chan during the Tang Dynasty (618-907), the overall picture remains fragmentary. Although it is generally accepted that the identity of Chan monks became more distinct during the ninth century at the time when the schism occurred between Mazu Daoyi's (709-788) immediate disciples, the definition of *the* "Chan School" lacks consensus. In the construction of the picture of early Chan Buddhism, the influence of Zongmi (780-84) was considerable, and later scholars have therefore tended to follow his picture of things. On the one hand he began to integrate ten diverse Chan schools into one grand narrative, and on the other hand he was strongly in favour of an integration of scholasticism and meditation. However, his representations do not correspond to earlier realities, which were more diffuse, even though there was a certain logic to the patterns of elements which retrospectively can be seen to have been relevant. In general, modern scholarship has overlooked what Zongmi overlooked. The present thesis therefore seeks to contribute to the field by providing historical revisions and by bringing in new resources for Chan studies: Japanese bibliographies, Chinese and Japanese commentaries on the Bodhisattva precepts, particular features of the legend of

Prince Shōtoku, and four Korean epitaphs. The above are all connected with each other in their perceptions of Chan Buddhism, and in their own way demonstrate the multiplicity of Chan Buddhism which flourished in East Asia. In contrast to the Chinese sources of the ninth century, the use of 'Chan' by outsiders discloses information which was concealed in China as a result of competition and censorship. For example, the Japanese bibliographies reveal a pattern of linkage between the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra*, but this linkage is not seen in Chinese sources due to the attack on the *Laṅkāvatāra* by Shenhui. Thanks to the polemical characteristics of the debates, one can approach Chan Buddhism through criticism, rejection and affirmation emanating from diverse opinions of the period. In seeing the texts as competing narratives, attention is given to the mechanism of selection, the intention of authors, how particular voices became dominant in certain areas, and how divergent forces took part in the suppression of other voices. Through all these processes a new direction emerges in the formation of *Chan*.

To understand what Chinese and Japanese monks meant by Chan Buddhism before the tenth century, we have to give up the categories frequently applied to it such as "school" or "sect." It is precisely the elusive and changing nature of Chan Buddhism which leads to the difficulty in answering the question what *Chan* was. This research argues that, in the ninth century, "*chan*" remained a generic term whereas "*Chanzong*", by being linked to the lineage of Bodhidharma, became a resource for community construction. In Chapter One, I began with an investigation into how classification was constructed in Japanese monks' bibliographies. In fact the Japanese bibliographies have hitherto been undervalued and used restrictively as a sourcebook for times and places of the occurrence of

various scriptures. However, given the ambiguity and immensity of the ideas of Chan Buddhism, medieval monks simultaneously began the task of integration and classification for doctrines of similar kinds. The bibliographies provide an assortment of combinations of the presence and absence of elements that were freely grouped together as Chan. The structure and categorisation in the bibliographies hence serve as a focused guide for finding out the doctrinal affiliations of Chan Buddhism in contemporaneous understanding. They also present a contrast to the later projection imposed by Chinese proponents of the Chan tradition. These Japanese documents are evidence for the affiliation of Chan texts and Bodhisattva precepts at an earlier stage, and correspond to the focus of discussion about the precepts and lineage in seventh century China. Following the trend of self-ordination and the reworking of Mahāyāna precepts in China from the fifth century onwards, new interpretations of ordination and precepts still required the legitimated authority of lineages during the absence of the Buddha. The lineage narratives matured in the eighth century, and the formless precepts and the construction of patriarchal images are persistently the core elements in them. Therefore precepts and patriarchs are major themes in every chapter of this dissertation.

The act of searching for authorisation to transmit Buddhism during the absence of the Buddha may be regarded as a response to anxiety over the decline of Buddhism during the seventh century in China. Chapter Two discussed the ways in which the belief in the decline of Buddhism shaped early Chan Buddhism. Firstly, the notion of "real practice" bolstered the argument against the exegetic tradition. Secondly, as doubts about exegetical tradition and scholasticism increased, the lineage of meditation monks was advanced to suggest a textual

transmission. It was such a success that after that the lineage was no longer questioned and all debates centred on the texts rather than on the figure of Bodhidharma. Taken together, we may conclude that the concept of lineage is a consequence of the anxiety over the decline of Buddhism. Fear of the decline of Buddhism led to the need to identify reliable sources of authority but also to the perplexities about whether textual or master transmission could best withstand the challenges of Buddhist persecutions and a decaying *saṃgha* in the capital cities. In the wake of the corruption of the exegetic tradition, the alternative meditation masters and vinaya masters began to compose the patriarch image to fill in the line of lineages. The confluence of all these aspects led to the rise of Chan Buddhism and the image of the patriarch known as Bodhidharma.

The Chinese Northern and Southern Dynasties saw tensions between corruption in the temples and petitions for reformation, as well as between scholastic monks in the capital and mendicant monks in the mountains. The competition between these two different strands of Buddhist thought was fierce. For mendicant monks, the path to enlightenment relies on practices, namely meditation and the practice of bodhisattva-hood, rather than preaching to emperors and aristocrats. This profound conflict between textual and patriarchal authorities led to the reworking of the meditational approach to enlightenment over against the exegetical approach. In order to disentangle the puzzling nature of early Chan Buddhism, Chapter Two traced the relationship between meditation, scholasticism and Vinaya through two themes: the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and Bodhidharma. This text and this patriarch were the essential elements of the earliest Chan lineages. Contrary to the common understanding of Chan Buddhism, the Chan patriarchs were supposed to back up the authority of scriptures. This

chapter further argues that those narratives linking the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and Bodhidharma explicate the need for new interpretations of meditational practice which gradually turned inward to mind practice.

Chapter Three focused on Chinese and Japanese commentaries which reflect institutional considerations in the shift of Chan Buddhism from the coalition of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra,* which draws more from the Yogācāra tradition, to the simpler *Diamond Sūtra* with a closer Mādhyamika association. The sixth century saw an increased emphasis on mind precepts, which meanwhile brought up controversial opinions about the bodhisattva ideal. A trace of this transformation is found in the discussions about Bodhisattva precepts which came to a final form in the *Platform Sūtra*. As seen from the arguments in relevant texts, the simplification of ordination rituals and formless precepts enabled self-ordination during the absence of the Buddha and facilitated the inclusion of the laity into Buddhist communities. On the one hand, in order to maintain the reputation of the *saṃgha* against the tendency of decline, purification through strict adherence to the precepts and meditation constituted the antidote. This connection between purity and meditation is most clearly expressed in Daoxuan's writings, and it existed in practice in the four-step process of Bodhisattva precepts conferral. On the other hand, the reworking of the Bodhisattva precepts by Huisi and Xinxing served as a new foundation for the ordination ceremony and shows a tendency to simplification which brought about the birth of the formless precepts in Chan Buddhism. The formless precepts supported a formless transmission through meditation, where the patriarchs become merely symbolic. A direct link to the Buddha is created in this way. This

simplified approach, in the spirit of skilful means, was developed from the fountainhead of Mahāyāna precepts.

All the doctrinal debates and historical records referred to above confirm the doctrinal affinity of the Chan tradition and the precepts as shown in the categorisation in the catalogues. In various traditions of Buddhist schools, it seems that, in connection with the purification of the mind, meditation and precepts are not separable; rather, arising on the basis of the praxis of enlightenment theory, they are two sides of the same coin. This is the doctrinal reason why the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* and the Bodhisattva precepts were grouped together and why this link occurred as a repetitive pattern in the Buddhist bibliographies. This association was not a feature found exclusively in either Chan or Esoteric Buddhism; rather, it was a common perception and praxis that developed in tandem with the development of Mahāyāna in China. The doctrinal and historical evolution of Mahāyāna ideas such as that of the Bodhisattva precepts, moved on to the point that a distinct "Chan" ideology gradually took a form that was able to persuade rulers of its usefulness for political leadership, precisely because of the simplification process.

In light of this tendency in the development of Bodhisattva precepts, we have seen the *Platform Sūtra* in this study as an attempt to legitimate a form of ordination which did not have traditional authority. The word "platform" in the title implies a strong institutional consideration. The function of the *Platform Sūtra* is analogous to that of the ordination platform, which can be summarised as: (a) to assure its legitimacy for transmission; (b) to incorporate a lineage for maintaining coherence in the transmission, after gaining independence from specific scriptures; (c) to find a new textual

authority; and (d) to gain a wider audience from the laity. After all, monasteries were the nexus and units of Buddhist development, and every transformation started from the level of monasticism; meanwhile, they were institutions inseparable from state censorship. The doctrinal affiliation between Chan and precepts pointed to contemporary institutional concerns, and the Bodhisattva precepts were especially important because they were so relevant to social relations between the clergy and lay people.

Turning away from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* to the “formless precepts” in the *Platform Sūtra* can be regarded as the result of a competition in search of the “Highest Vehicle”. Emperor Xuanzong’s preference for the *Diamond Sūtra*, in parallel with the spread of the *Vajrasamādhi Sūtra* in Korea, indicate a tendency towards the simplification and domestication of Buddhism in the wider context of East Asia. Similarities in polemics between various Buddhist traditions demonstrate the necessity to consider East Asian Buddhist countries as a whole. During the evolutional process of Chan ideology, it is worth noting that the shifting attitude towards the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* stands in contrast with the long-lasting popularity of Bodhidharma, whose symbolic role as a foreign patriarch became even greater than before. The contemporary perception of Bodhidharma was pursued in the next chapter.

Chapter Four was about Saichō, in particular the relationship between meditation and precepts in his launch of “Sudden and Perfect” precepts, and his disciples’ perception of the figure of Bodhidharma: themes which integrated those of the previous two chapters. Saichō’s precepts have a “Northern Chan” origin where he inherited a syncretic approach to precepts and the lineage of Bodhidharma. Dōsen’s integration of “Northern Chan” teachings and Bodhisattva

precepts provided a foundation for Saichō's grasp of Chan and precepts before he went to China. His short stay in southern China intensified his feeling of ethnic tension, which reflected the background when Daosui taught him Perfect (Bodhisattva) precepts. All the Chinese monks' teachings on emptiness, threefold learning, meditation and Perfect precepts were integrated into Saichō's "Perfect and Sudden precepts". This demonstrates the continuing synthesis of Chan and precepts in China and Japan. Needless to say, Saichō's understanding was determined by his time in China and further developed in Japan. The legitimation of Saichō's Precepts, however, relied on his disciples' conception of the figure Bodhidharma, whose symbolic image proves to be particularly significant in precept conferral and lineage invention. To his disciples, namely Kōjō and Enchin, this lineage of Bodhidharma was an important authority for the transmission of Bodhisattva precepts. This conceptualisation was in fact initiated in Daoxin's community in late seventh century China.

Saichō and his disciples' ideas about Bodhidharma are valuable for understanding the overall development of Chan, because this Indian patriarch stood for a cross-cultural transmission from the outset. Due to intensive interaction between Japanese, Chinese and Korean monks, the multi-cultural character of the Bodhidharma lineage contributed to the cultural identity of Japanese monks. Although Bodhidharma was reinterpreted as an authoritative figure in various ways by Japanese Tendai monks, their understanding of Bodhidharma is basically the same as that of Chinese monks. The coalition of meditation and precepts is fundamentally the same, in its main tenor, as the Chinese threefold learning and Tiantai's Perfect Precepts. These doctrines were all meant to provide new interpretations of theories of enlightenment and a

discourse on legitimacy. The example of Saichō shows therefore that constraints similar to those experienced in China, e.g. the assumption of living in the age of the "latter Dharma", were met by similar decisions and solutions elsewhere in East Asia.

The international environment in the ninth century is characterised by intensive interaction between the Buddhist currents of East Asian countries. The later part of this study therefore went on to evaluate how the self-image of Buddhists in China, Japan and Korea, boosted by cross-cultural encounters, differentially affected the profile of Chan Buddhism in the ninth century. The views held by Buddhists of different ethnic origin show discrepancies in contents but similarities in strategies. A striking feature is that the agenda always outweighs the doctrine, which implies that the key attribute of early Chan lay not in its doctrine, but in its function. The Chan rhetoric played a crucial part in the dynamics of the acculturation of Buddhism in ninth century Korea and Japan, and this pattern corresponded to that of the sinification of Buddhism in China itself.

Chapter Five focused on the reincarnation legend of Shōtoku Taishi which was dominated by the concept of "the Dharma moves eastward", while Chapter Six discussed the ways in which an increasing sense of legitimacy in Korea and Japan incorporated elements from the tales of Chan patriarchs. The reincarnation story demonstrates a mostly neglected connection between Shōtoku Taishi and Chan Buddhism and it sheds light, without regard to later sectarian boundaries, on the connections between the image of the Japanese prince and the legend cycles of the Chinese patriarch Huisi. Since a trans-historical connection is made between these two major figures through the reincarnation legend, it provides a connection which is in a way equivalent to a lineage. The mechanism

of lineage creation, once set in motion, continued for centuries in Japan, and was carried forward most notably by the leaders of Tendai Buddhism. It is from their texts that the reincarnation stories centring on Shōtoku Taishi were incorporated into a thorough-going lineage-creation process. The lineage was in fact centred more on the Chinese patriarch Huisi than on the Japanese prince, because the figure of Huisi could be presented as a foreign patriarch. A patriarch from across the sea in China was necessary because of the concept of the movement of the Dharma shifting from west to east. It is a logic of importation and legitimation similar to the need for the promotion of the Indian Bodhidharma as a patriarch in China. In this aspect alone, the invention of the reincarnation legend shared much ground with lineage invention in the Chan tradition in China, in which the importance of Bodhidharma increased in the context of centre-periphery relations in the framework of the Buddhist worldview.

The reincarnation story also displays intriguing Sino-Japan relations within the Buddhist tradition. In the early eighth century, Japanese monks were preoccupied with their own position in relation to the Buddhist "motherland" of either China or India, which were to some extent competing foci of respect. Japanese writers adopted innovative ways to supersede or even overthrow the central position of China, but at the same time they took up the Chinese conception of lineage and authority in Buddhist transmission. Accordingly, a significant continuity can be seen in the process of the domestication or acculturation of Buddhism during the eighth and ninth centuries across East Asia. Politics within the societies influenced by Buddhism dominated the process of legend invention, while at the same time the new discourse reshaped the self-definition of the Tendai sect from Saichō onwards. Their new self-definition

relates to how Japanese monks located themselves within the broader context of East Asian Buddhism; their claims in the reincarnation legend reveal the authors' motives to have been a rearrangement of the Sino-Japanese association.

At the same time this story reaffirms Bodhidharma's importance in the Chan tradition, either as a "textual paradigm" to use Faure's term or "a living dialogue between India and China" in Yanagida's words. Nevertheless, early records of Bodhidharma are extremely vague, and later hagiography embellishes most extravagantly. As Chapters Two, Three and Four demonstrate, the implications of Bodhidharma for Chan tradition were imposed and fabricated, while in reality the Chinese master Huisi had played a more influential role. The reason for the preference for Bodhidharma over Huisi in the lineage brings our attention back to the formation of the standard patriarchal image. An Indian and mysterious figure was needed because of the Chinese consciousness of being distant from the Buddha. The construction of lineages was an effective way of avoiding reliance on any single contemporaneous authority. The projection of the authority of patriarchs is able to transcend the limitations of time. The change of attitude towards Bodhidharma, from an Indian teacher to a patriarch, is one important indicator of the development of early Chan. Bodhidharma was first not seen as the "First Chan Patriarch" but simply as an Indian monk who had come to China through the Western territories. Entering the seventh century, the characteristics of Bodhidharma as a traveller across the state boundaries was emphasised more. This idea was taken up in the trope of the rebirth story of Shōtoku Taishi which was completed in the ninth century by Kōjō. The story of Shōtoku Taishi brings out a particular genealogy which transcends both spatial limits and sectarian boundaries. It is widely accepted that the Buddhist sectarian

history of China and Japan, largely boosted by hagiographical writing and lineage making, began from around the seventh century, but the sectarian identity of Buddhists such as the authors of this story eludes precise definition.

Chapter Six continued the discussion of the rise in the consciousness of sense of legitimacy during the ninth century which tended to emphasise the concept of centre versus periphery in East Asian Buddhism. For this reason, Buddhist intellectuals strove to devise new methods to enable them to incorporate in their own culture the elements of the ideal image of Chan, namely Bodhidharma's lineage and ascetic power and the concept of themselves being at the centre. Thus the ambition of occupying China's centre position for Chan/Zen Buddhism emerged as a continuing process. To appraise the significance of this discourse, Chapter Six examined two Buddhist writers, the Japanese monk Kōjō and the Korean intellectual Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn, against the broader background of ninth century East Asian Buddhism. The writings of both of these figures illustrate the process of the construction of cultural identity through Chan Buddhism. Culture and religion joined together in this process, first in China and then in Japan and Korea. With the texts discussed in this chapter, we discovered a mechanism: cultural identity hinged on a syncretistic rationalisation formula chosen by the elites, and on the adaptations involved. It was apparently because of inseparable thematic connections in Buddhist thought that we see examples of changes occurring in China soon having an impact on Korea and Japan; and vice versa. On the other hand, the location of centrality or marginality was not precisely fixed in the Buddhist worldview. Rather, innovative Buddhist intellects such as Kōjō and Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn could therefore venture to create a reversal of centre and margin. In Kōjō's writing, the myth of Bodhidharma and Shōtoku

Taishi came to be promoted as a dominant theme. It provided a helpful ideology for sense of legitimacy and cultural identity. His writing discloses the competition concerning religious discourses in political bargaining which was characteristic of that period. In Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's inscriptions, an attempt to supersede China through Chan Buddhism is conspicuous. Just as with Kōjō, this discourse provided a helpful ideology for sense of legitimacy and cultural identity. We have illustrated here the birth and dissemination process of an idea which had the potential to become an ideology. This idea, drawn from Chan Buddhism, formed the worldview of contemporaneous elites, and it framed the primitive international relations of ninth century East Asia.

The aspects of Chan Buddhism that Ch'oe and Kōjō's perceptions bring out are consistent with the strand of thought discussed in previous chapters. Their definition of *Chan* is inseparable from the distinction between practice and teaching. An increased emphasis on the bodhisattva mind is integrated into the image of meditation masters. Even their attempt to replace the central position of China is following fundamentally the same pattern as that of the sinicisation of Buddhism in China proper. The only difference, quite naturally, lies in the discourse regarding the "Dharma moved east", which was stressed more in Japan and Korea. It illustrates the feature of a Buddhism shifting across East Asia. In the context of the cross-border transmission of Buddhism, the mobility of "patriarchs" was essential in maintaining legitimacy and continuity. This characteristic of the mobility of patriarchs is seen in Bodhidharma, Huisi, Prince Shōtoku, Chingam, Ranghye and Chijŭng.

Overall, this research consists of a critical study of the formation of early Chan/Zen Buddhism in China and Japan. It focuses on aspects of the sectarian and

polemical environment in which Chan was created and developed into being a significant presence in Chinese religious life. By including views from China, Japan and Korea we have investigated the ways in which different understandings of *Chan* have been understood and constructed by monks and literati in the ninth century. The conclusions at which we arrive undercut the validity of traditional historical views about the establishment of Chan Buddhism in China. The result is a redefinition of the implications of the figure of Bodhidharma, of the ways in which Chan Buddhism functions, and the approach of Chan to the acquisition and assertion of authority. In sum, early Chan Buddhism was formulated within the paradoxical relationship between the transmission of "enlightenment" "from mind to mind" and the persistent role of precepts, lineage lines, and various institutional perceptions.

Cited Works

Primary Sources:

Chŏsen kinseki sŏran 朝鮮金石總覽, Chŏsen Sŏtokufu 朝鮮總督府, 2 volumes, Keijō, Chōsen Sōtokufu Taishō 8, 1919.

Dai nihon Bukkyō zensho 大日本仏教全書, Tokyo: Nihon Bussho kankōkai, 1912-1922. [*BZ*]

Dai nihon zokuzōkyō 大日本續藏經, Kyoto: Zokyo Shoin, 1905-1912.

Dengyō daishi zenshū 傳教大師全集, 5 volumes, Tokyo: Nihon Bussho kankōkai, 1975 (reprint from 1926). [*DZ*]

Nara ibun 寧樂遺文, Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三 (1965), ed., Tokyo: Tōkyōdō shuppan, vol. 3.

Quan Tang Wen 全唐文 (1808-1814), 1000 fascicles, compiled by Dong Gao 董誥 (1740-1818), Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1990. [*QIW*]

Quan Tang wen xinbian 全唐文新編, Changchun: Jilin wenshi chubanshe, 2000.

Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大藏經 (*Taishō Tripitaka*), 100 volumes, Tokyo: The Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai, 1924 (reprint in 1962). [T]

Tang Guoshi Bu 唐國史補 , Li Zhao 李肇 (fl. 806-820), vol. 1, Shanghai : Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1957.

Wang Wei ji 王維集, by Wang Wei 王維 (701 - 761).Tiemin Chen 陳鐵民, ed., Beijing: Zhinghua shuju, 1997.

Dictionary:

Bukkyō daijiten 仏教大辞典, Oda Tokunō 織田得能, Tokyo: Okura Shoten, 1929.

Dengyō daishi zenshū sakuin 傳教大師全集索引, Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1988.

Komazawa daigaku zengaku daijiden 駒沢大学禅学大辞典, Tokyo : Taishukan Shoten, 1985.

Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten 望月佛教大辞典, Mochizuki Shink 望月信亨, Tokyo : Sekai Seiten Kanko Kyokai, 1966-1968.

Secondary Resources:

Abé, Ryūichi (2008), "Scholasticism, Exegesis, and Ritual Practice: On Renovation in the History of Buddhist Writing in the Early Heian Periods", in *Heian Japan, Centres and Peripheries,* Mikael Adolphson, Edward Kamens, and Stacie Matsumoto, eds., Univ. of Hawaii Press, pp. 179-211.

Adamek, Wendi L. (2007), *The Mystique of Transmission: On an Early Chan History and Its Contexts,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Akira, Hirakawa 平川彰 (1997), "Chigi niokeru shōmon to bosatsukai" 智顗における聲聞戒と菩薩戒 (The Meanings of Śrāvaka- Śīla and Bodhisattva-Śīla Interpreted by Chih-i), in *Tendai daishi kenkyū* 天台大師研究, Tokyo: Tendai gakkai, pp.1-26.

Amino Yoshihiko 網野 善彦(1992), "Deconstructing *Japan*", in *East Asian History* 3, (June 1992), pp. 121-142.

Andō Kōsei 安藤更生 (1960), *Ganjin daiwajō den no kenkyū* 鑑真大和上伝之研究, Tokyo: Heibonsha.

----- (1958), *Ganjin* 鑑真 (688-763), Tokyo: Bijutsu shuppansha.

Andō, Toshio **安藤俊雄** and Sonoda, Kōyū **薗田香融** (1991), eds., *Saichō: Kenkairon, Sange gakushōshiki, tagōhen* **最澄—顕戒論、山家学生式、他五篇**, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Barrett, T. H. (2009) "Rebirth from China to Japan in Nara Hagiography: A Reconsideration", in *Buddhist Studies Review* 26.1 (2009).

------- (2005a), 'History,' in Donald S. Lopez, *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 124-142.

------- (2005b), 'Buddhist precepts in a lawless world: some comments on the Linhuai ordination Scandal,' in William M. Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

------- (2002), "Inner and Outer Ritual: Some Remarks on a Directive Concerning Daoist Dragon-casting Ritual from Dunhuang", in Lee Cheuk Yin and Chan Man Sing, eds, *Daoyuan binfen lu / a Daoist florilegium: a festschrift dedicated to Professor Liu Ts'un-yan on his eighty-fifth birthday.* Xianggang: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2002, pp. 315-334.

------- (1998), *The Religious Affiliations of the Chinese Cats: An Essay towards An Anthropozoological Approach to Comparative Religion*, No. 2, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

------- (1996), *Taoism under the T'ang: religion & empire during the golden age of Chinese history*, London: Wellsweep.

------- (1992), *Li Ao: Buddhist, Taoist, or Neo-Confucian?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

------- (1991), "The Date of the Leng-chia shih-tzu chih", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1.2 (1991), pp. 255-9.

------- (1990), "Kill the Patriarchs!" in *The Buddhist Forum*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, pp. 87-97.

Batten, Bruce L. (2003), *To the Ends of Japan: Premodern Frontiers, Boundaries, and Interactions*, Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press.

------- (1986), "Foreign Treat and Domestic Reform: The Emergence of the Ritsuryō State", *Monumentica Nipponica* 41.2 (1986), pp. 93-112.

Benn, James A. (2009), "The Silent *S*aṃgha: Some Observations on Mute Sheep Monks", in *JIABS* 32, no. 1-2, 2009 (2010), pp. 11 – 38.

Bielefeldt, Carl (1986), "Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse's *Tso-Ch'an I* and the 'Secret' of Zen Meditation", in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 129-162.

Bingenheimer, Marcus (2003-4), "A translation of the *Tōdaiwajō tōseiden* 唐大和上東征傳 (T.2089 (7))", in *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* No.4 (2003) & No.5 (2004).

Bingenheimer, Marcus and Justin Ritzinger (2006), "Whole Body Relics in Chinese Buddhism – Previous Research and Historical Overview," *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* No.7 (2006), pp.37-94

Blum, Mark L. (2006), "The *Sangoku-Mappō* Construct: Buddhism, Nationalism, and History in Medieval Japan," in *Discourse and Ideology in Medieval Japanese Buddhism*, eds., Richard K. Payne and Taigen Dan Leighton, London; New York: Routledge, pp. 31-51.

Bodiford, William M. (2005), "Bodhidharma's Precepts in Japan", in *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, Bodiford, ed., Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 185 – 209.

Bowring, Richard (2005), *The Religious Traditions of Japan, 500-1600*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brook, Timothy (2005) on “Institution” in *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, ed. by Donald S. Lopez, Chicago: the University of Chicago, pp. 143-161.

Buswell, Robert E., Jr. (2005), ed., *Currents and Countercurrents : Korean influences on the East Asian Buddhist traditions*, Honolulu : University of Hawai’i Press.

------ (1989), *The Formation of Ch’an Ideology in China and Korea: the Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon,* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Campany, Robert (2003), “On the Very Idea of Religions (in the Modern West and in Early Medieval China),” *History of Religions* 42.4, pp. 287-319.

Chappell, David W. (1989), “Formless Repentance in Comparative Perspective”, in *Fo Kuang Shan Report of International Conference on Ch’an Buddhism*, pp. 251- 67.

------- (1983), “The Teachings of the Fourth Ch’an Patrairch Tao-hsin (580-651),” in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, eds. Lewis Lancaster and Whalen Lai, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Chen, Jinhua (2008), *Legend and Legitimation: The Formation of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan*, Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, vol. 30. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises.

------ (2002a), ‘An Alternative View of the Meditation Tradition in China: Meditation in the Life and Works of Dauxuan (596-667)’, *T’oung Pao* 88.4-5, pp. 332-395.

------- (2002b), *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship*. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies.

-------- (2002c), “*Pusaseng* (Bodhisattva-monks): A Peculiar Monastic Institution at the Turn of the Northern Zhou (557-581) and Sui Dynasties (581-618)”, *Journal of Chinese Religions* 30 (2002): 1-22.

-------- (1999), *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies.

--------- (1998), “The Construction of Early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism: The Japanese Provenance of Saichō’s Transmission Documents and Three Esoteric Buddhist Apocrypha Attributed to Śubhākarasiṃha,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 21.1 (1998), pp. 21-76.

Chou, Po-kan 周伯戡, “Du Sengrui *Xiaopinjing xu”* 讀僧叡「小品經序」, *Taida lishi xuebao* 臺大歷史學報 23 (1999 Jun), pp. 157-198.

Cole, Alan (2009), *Fathering Your Father: The Zen of Fabrication in Tang Buddhism*, California: University of California Press.

Como, Michael I. (2006), *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Ch'oe, Pyŏnghŏn 崔柄憲 (1976), "Silla hadae Sŏnjong Kusanp'a ŭi sŏngnip: Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn ŭi sasan pimyŏng ŭl chungsim ŭro" 新羅下代禪宗九山派의成立: 崔致遠의四山碑銘을中心으로 (The establishment of the Nine Mountains Sŏn lineage during the latter Silla, focusing on Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn's stelae inscriptions from four mountains), in *Han'guk sa nonmun sŏnjip* (*Kodae p'yŏn*) 韓國史論文選集(古代篇) (Essay-collection on Korean History: Ancient Period), vol. 2, edited by Yŏksa hakkoe 歷史學會, Seoul: Ilchogak. , pp. 265-321.

Ch'oe, Yŏngsŏng 崔英成 (1987), *Chuhae Sasan pimyŏng* 註解四山碑銘, Asea munhwasa: Seoul, pp. 1-27; Ch'oe Yŏngsŏng (1990), *Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn ŭi sasang yŏn'gu: purok: Sasan pimyŏng chipju* 崔致遠의思想研究 附錄、四山碑銘集註. Asea munhwasa: Seoul

Durt, Hubert (1994), *Problems of Chronology and Eschatology: Four Lectures on the "Essay on Buddhism" by Tominaga Nakamoto (1715-1746),* Kyoto: Istituto Italiano di Cultura, Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale.

Emmerick, R. E. (1970), *The Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarnabhāsottamasūtra*, London : Luzac, 1970,

Etani, Ryūkai 恵谷隆戒, "Nangaku Eshi no rissei gammon wa gisaku ka" 南岳慧思の立誓願文は偽作か, in *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 6-2 (1958), pp. 524-7.

Faure, Bernard (1997), *The Will to Orthodoxy: A Critical Genealogy of Northern Chan Buddhism*, translated into English by Phyllis Brooks, Stanford, Calif : Stanford University Press.

-------(1986a), 'Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm', in *History of Religions* 25 (2), pp. 187-198.

--------(1986b), "The Theory of One-Practice Sam´dhi in Early Ch'an", in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, pp. 99-128.

Forte, Antonino (1976), *Political propaganda and ideology in China at the end of the seventh century: inquiry into the nature, authors and function of the Tunhuang document S.6502, followed by an annotated translation*, Napoli : Istituto universitario orientale, Seminario di studi asiatici.

Foulk, Theodore Griffith (1999), "Sung Controversies Concerning the 'Separate Transmission' of Ch'an," in *Buddhism in the Sung*, eds., Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Honolulu: University of Hawai`i Press, pp. 220-294

-------- (1993), “Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch’an Buddhism”, in Patricia Buckley Ebrey & Peter N. Gregory, eds., *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. .

-------- (1987), *The “Ch’an School” and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition*, PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.

Fujiyoshi Masumi 藤善眞澄 (2002), *Dōsen den no kenkyū* 道宣伝の研究, Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, 2002 (東洋史研究叢刊: 60).

Fukuda Gyōei 福田堯穎 (1954-1959), *Tendaigaku gairon* 天台学概論, Tokyo : Bun'ichi Shuppan.

Funaoka Makoto 船岡 誠 (1987), *Nihon zenshū no seiritsu* 日本禅宗の成立 , Tokyo : Yoshikawa Kobunkan.

Funayama, Toru 船山 徹 (2000), ‘*Tang Buddhism and the* Sapoduo shizi zhuan (Record of the Masters of the Sarvāstivāda School) *Compiled by Sengyou of the Liang Dynasty*’ 梁の僧祐撰《薩婆多師資傳》と唐代佛教, in *Tōdai no shūkyō* 唐代の宗教, ed. by Yoshikawa Tadao 吉川忠夫, Research Report of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, Kyoto: Hōyū shoten, pp. 325 – 54.

-------- (1995), “Rokuchō jidai ni okeru bosakkai no juyō katei: Rūsō, Nanseiki wo chūshin ni” 六朝時代における菩薩戒の受容過程—劉宋．南齊期を中心に, in *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 67, pp. 1 – 135.

Gellner, Ernest (1964), *Thought and Change*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Gernet, Jacques (1995), *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*, Franciscus Verellen, trans., Columbia Univ Press, first published in French in 1956.

Greene, Eric (2008), “Another Look at Early *Chan*: Daoxuan, Bodhidharma, and the Three Levels Movement”, in *T’oung Pao* 94, No. 1-3, (2008), pp. 49-114.

Gregory, Peter N. (1991), *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

------ (1987), ed., *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

Groner, Paul (1990), "The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen’s *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku"*, in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed., Robert Buswell, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, pp. 251-290.

------- (1989), “The Ordination Ritual in the Platform Sūtra within the Context of the East Asian Buddhist Vinaya Tradition”, in *Fo Kuang Shan Report of International Conference on Ch’an Buddhism*, pp. 220-50.

------- (1984), *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, Seoul : Po Chin Chai.

Guo Zhonghan 郭中翰 (1998), *Liang Su (753-793 C.E.) and the Restoration of Literature (wen-chang or literary compositions) as well as the Learning of Nature and Destiny in the mid-T’ang China*, MA diss. (1998), National Ching Hwa University, Taiwan.

Haas, Ernst B. (1997), *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress*, vol. 1 (2 vols), Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hayami Tasuku 速水 侑 (1986), *Nihon Bukkyōshi: Kodai* 日本仏教史－古代 (History of Japanese Buddhism: The Ancient Period), Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 (1997), “Chigi ni okeru shōmon to bosatsukai” 智顗における聲聞戒と菩薩戒 (The Meanings of Śrāvaka- Śīla and Bodhisattva-Śīla Interpreted by Chih-i), in *Tendai daishi kenkyū* 天台大師研究, Tokyo: Tendai gakkai, pp.1-26.

Hsiao Bea-hui, *Two Images of Maitreya: Fu Hsi and Pu-tai Ho-shang*, PhD dissertation, School of Oriental and African Studies, 1995.

Hu Shi (1953), "Chan/Zen Buddhism in China: Its History and Method", in *Philosophy East and West* 3.1 pp. 3-24.

------- (1932), "The Development of Zen Buddhism in China", in *Chinese Social and Political Science Review* 15.4, pp. 475-505.

Hubbard, Jamie (2001), *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood: The Rise and Fall of a Chinese Heresy*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

Hurvitz, Leon (1962), “Chih-I (538-597): An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk”, in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, Institut Belge des hautes études chinoises, Douziøme Volumne: 1960-62, Bruxelles, Juillet 1962, pp. 1-372.

Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿 (1973), *Ganjin: sono kairitsu shisō* 鑑真—その戒律思想, Tokyo: Daizō shuppansha.

Ishii Shūdō 石井修道 (1978), “Kōshūshū ni okeru Seidō Chizō no ichi ni tsuite” 洪州宗における西堂智蔵の位置について, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 53(27-1), pp. 280-84.

----- (1978), ed., *E'nō kenkyū: E'nō no denki to shiryō ni kansuru kisoteki kenkyū* 慧能研究 : 慧能の傳記と資料に關する基礎的研究, ed. Ishii Shūdō 石井修道 et al., Komazawa daigaku zenshūshi kenkyūkai 駒澤大學禪宗史研究會, Tōkyō: Taishūkan shoten 大修館書店, 1978.

Jan Yun-hua **冉雲華** (1972), 'Tsung-mi: His Analysis of Chan Buddhism', in *T'oung Pao* 58 (1978), pp. 1-54.

Janousch, Andreas (1999a), "The Emperor as Bodhisattva: The Bodhisattva Ordination and Ritual Assemblies of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty", in *State and Court Ritual in China*, Joseph P. McDermott, ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---- (1999b), "The Emperor as Bodhisattva: the Bodhisattva Ordination and Ritual Assemblies of Emperor Wu of the Liang Dynasty", in *State and Court Ritual in China*, ed., Joseph P. McDermott, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Jia Jinhua (2006), *Hongzhou School of Chan Buddhism in Eighth- Through Tenth-Century China*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Jorgensen, John J. (2005), *Inventing Hui-neng, the Sixth Patriarch: Hagiography and Biography in Early Ch'an*, Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Kamstra, J.H. (1967), *Encounter or Syncretism*: *The Initial Growth of Japanese Buddhism*, Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.

Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆 (1961), "Zenkai shisō no tenkai", in *Dōgen zenshi to sono monryū* 道元禪師とその門流, Tokyo: Seishin Shobō, pp. 149-173, (reprinted from 1939).

Kamata, Shigeo **鎌田茂雄** (1971), trans., *Zengen shosenshū tojo* **禅源諸詮集都序** [originally by Shūmitsu **宗密**(480-841)]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

Kawakatsu Yoshio 川勝義雄 (1982), "Chūgoku teki shinbukkyō keisei he no enerugi- : Nangaku Eishi no baai" 中国的新仏教形成へのエネルギー : 南岳慧思の場合 (The energy towards the new Buddhism in China), in Fukunaga Mitsuji 福永光司 ed.,中国中世の宗教と文化 *Chūgoku chūsei no shūkyō to bunka*, 京都大学人文科学研究所, 1982, pp. 501-538.

Kawamoto Yoshiaki 川本 芳昭 (2003), "Sai Chien to Abe no Nakamaro—Kōdai Chōsen Nihon ni okeru *Chūgokuka* to no kanren kara mita" 崔致遠と阿倍仲麻呂--古代朝鮮・日本における「中国化」との関連から見た (On Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn and Abe no Nakamaro: The Aspect of the "Sinicisation" in Antient Korea and Japan), *The Oriental Studies* (九州大学東洋史論集), No. 31 (2003.4), pp. 181 – 204.

Kieschnick, John (1997), *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist ideals in medieval Chinese hagiography*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Kuo, Li-ying (1994), *Confession et contrition dans le bouddhisme chinois du Ve au Xe siècle*, Paris: EFEO.

Lancaster, Lewis (1989), "The terminology of the *Platform Sūtra* in the Chinese Buddhist Canon", in *Fo Kuang Shan Report of International Conference on Ch'an Buddhism*, pp. 51-54.

Lei Wen 雷 聞, *Jiaomiao zhiwai: Sui Tang guojia jisi yu zongjiao* 郊廟之外—隋唐國家祭祀與宗教 (Beyond the altars of the state: State sacrifices and religions of the Sui and Tang dynasties). Beijing: Shenghuo, dushu, xinzhi sanlian shudian, 2009.

Lu, Yang (2004), "Narrative and Historicity in the Buddhist Biographies of Early Medieval China: the Case of Kumārajīva", *Asia Major* 3rd Series 17.2 (2004), pp. 1-43.

Magnin, Paul (1979), *La vie et l'œuvre de Huisi (515-577) : les origines de la secte bouddhique chinoise du Tiantai*, Paris, École Française d'Extrême-Orient : Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Matsuda, Miryō 松田未亮 (2004), *"Daijō shikan hōmon" no kenkyū* 大乗止観法門の研究, Tokyo : Sankibo Busshorin.

McMullen, David L. (1988), *State and Scholars in T'ang China*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McRae, John (2005), 'Daoxuan's Vision of *Jetavana*: the Ordination Platform Movement in Medieval Chinese Buddhism,' in William M. Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press.

------ (2003), *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

------- (2001), "Religion as Revolution in Chinese Historiography: Hu Shih (1891-1962) on Shen-hui (684-758)", in *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 12, pp. 59-102.

------(1988), "The Story of Early Ch'an'" in Kenneth Kraft, ed., *Zen: Tradition and Transition*, New York: Grove Press, pp. 125-139.

------(1987), "Shen-hui and the Teaching of Sudden Enlightenment ", in *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, ed., Peter N. Gregory, Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press, 1987, pp. 227-278.

------(1986), *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

-------(1983), “The Ox-head School of Chinese Buddhism: From Early Ch’an to the Golden Age”, in Gimello M. Robert & Peter N. Gregory, eds., *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen*, Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press, pp. 169-253.

Morrison, Elizabeth (2010), *The Power of Patriarchs: Qisong and Lineages in Chinese Buddhism*, Leiden: Brill.

Nagao, Gadjin M. (1991), *Mādyamika and Yogācāra: A Study of Mahāyāna Philosophies*, ed., collated and trans. by L.S. Kawamura, Albany, N.Y. : State University of New York Press

Nattier, Jan (2003), *A Few Good Men: the Bodhisattva Path according to the Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

------ (1991), *Once upon a Future Time*: *Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*, Nanzan Studies in Asian Religions, Berkeley, Calif. : Asian Humanities Press.

Nishimoto Teruma 西本照真 (1998), *Sankaikyō no kenkyū* 三階教の研究, Tokyo: Shunjun-sha.

Ogura Toyofumi 小倉豊文 (1985), “Sangyō gisho Jōgūō-sen ni kansuru gigi” 三経義疏上宮王撰上宮王撰に関する疑義 (Doubts concerning Prince Shōtoku’s Authorship of Sangyō gisho), in Tamura Enchō and Kawagishi Kōkyō, eds., *Shōtoku Taishi to Asuka Bukkyō*, Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, pp. 144-167.

Ōkubo Ryōshun **大久保良峻** (2004), ed., *Sange no daishi Saichō* 山家の大師 最澄, Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan.

Ōno Hōdō 大野法道 (1954), *Daijō kaikyō no kenkyū* 大乗戒経の研究, Tokyo: Risōsha, 1954.

Ono Katsutoshi **小野勝年** (1982), *Nittō guhō gyōreki no kenkyū: Chishō Daishi Enchin hen* 入唐求法行歴の研究—智証大師円珍篇, Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

------- (1964-1969), *Nittō guhō junrei gyōki no kenkyū* 入唐求法巡礼行記の研究, 3 volumes, Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan.

Orzech, Charles D. (1998), *Politics and Transcendent Wisdom: the Scripture for Humane Kings in the Creation of Chinese Buddhism*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Ōta Teizō 太田悌蔵 (1956), “Dentō, dōtō, kōtō” 伝灯・道統・皇統, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 7 (4-1), pp. 67-70.

Ōyama Seiichi 大山誠一 (2003), *Shōtoku Taishi no shinjitsu* 聖徳太子の真実, Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Palumbo, Antonello, “Sending the Alien Monks back to the Marchlands: a Forgotten Nationalisation of Buddhism in Tang China”, unpublished manuscript

Poceski, Mario (2007), *Ordinary Mind as the Way: the Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism,* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Pye, Michael (1990), *Emerging from Meditation*, Tominaga Nakamoto (1715-1746), translated with an introduction by Michael Pye, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

------ (1986), “Tradition and authority in Shin Buddhism”, *The Pure Land (New Series)* 3, pp. 37-48.

Rhodes, Robert F. (2006), “The Beginning of Pure Land Buddhism in Japan: From its Introduction through the Nara Period”, *Japanese Religions* 31.1 (2006), pp. 1-22.

Robson, James (2011), “Formation and Fabrication in the History and Historiography of Chan Buddhism,” in *HJAS* 71.2 (2011), Harvard-Yenching Institute, pp. 311-349.

------- (2010), “Monastic Spaces and Sacred Traces: Facets of Chinese Buddhist Monastic Records”, in J. A. Benn, L. Meeks and J. Robson, eds., *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, NY: Routledge, pp. 1-17.

------- (2009), *Power of Place: The Religious Landscape of the Southern Sacred Peak [Nanyue 南嶽] in Medieval China*, Harvard Asia Center. Cambrifge: Harvard Univ. Press.

Saeki, Arikiyo 佐伯有清(1992), *Dengyō Daishi den no kenkyū* 伝教大師伝の研究**,** Tokyo : Yoshikawa Kobunkan.

------- (1990), Enchin 円珍, *Nihon Rekishi Gakkai henshū* 日本歴史学会編集. Tōkyō : Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

------- (1989), *Ennin* 円仁, Nihon Rekishi Gakkai henshū 日本歴史学会編修. Tokyo : Yoshikawa Kobunkan.

------- (1986), *Jikaku Daishi den no kenkyū* 慈覚大師伝の研究**,** Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan

Saitō Tomohiro 斎藤智寛 (2008), “Satorenakatta hitobito—Zen Ritsu sōshūsha no inori to sukui”悟れなかった人人—禅律双修者の祈りと救い, in *Tōhō Gakuhō* 東方学報 82, pp. 69-117.

Sasaki, Shizuka 佐々木閑 (1999), *Shukke to wa nani ka* 出家とはなにか, Tōkyō: Daizō shuppansha.

Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄 (1986),), *Chūgoku bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū* 中国仏教における戒律の研究. Tōkyō : Mokujisha.

Seidel, Anna (1981), "Kokuhō: note à propos du terme 'trésor national' en Chine et au Japon", *BEFEO* (*Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient*) 69, p. 229-261.

Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大 (1969), *Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止観の研究, Tokyo: Iwanami.

------ (1961), "Jubosatsukaigi darumabon ni tsuite" 授菩薩戒儀達磨本について, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 9-2 (1961), pp. 465-470.

------ (1957), *Daruma Daishi no kenkyū* 達磨大師の研究, Tokyo: Shunju sha.

Sen, Tansen (2003), *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600-1400*, University of Hawai'i Press (reprinted at Delhi, 2004).

Sharf, Robert (2002), "On Pure Land Buddhism And Ch'an/Pure Land Syncretism In Medieval China", in *T'oung Pao* 88, No. 4-5, pp. 282-331.

------- (2001), *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

------- (1992), "The Idolization of Enlightenment: On the Mummification of Ch'an Masters in Medieval China", in *History of Religions* 32.1 (1992), pp. 1-31.

Shengyan 聖嚴法師 (1999), *Dasheng zhiguan famen zhi yanjiu* 大乘止觀法門之研究, Taipei: Fagu wenhua shiye.

Shinohara, Koichi (1988), "Two Sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: Stupa Inscriptions and Miracle Stories", in *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*, eds., Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara, Oakville, Ont. : Mosaic Press, pp. 119-228.

Skorupski, Tadeusz (2001), *The Buddhist Forum*, volume 6, Tring: Institute of Buddhist Studies 2001.

Sone, Masato 曽根正人 (2007), *Shōtoku Taishi to Asuka Bukkyō* 聖徳太子と飛鳥仏教, Tokyo : Yoshikawa Kobunkan.

--------- (2000), *Kodai Bukkyōkai to ōchō shakai* 古代仏教会と王朝社会, Tokyo : Yoshikawa Kobunkan.

Sonoda, Kōyū 薗田香融 (1991), "Saichō to sono shisō" 最澄とその思想, in Andō Toshio 安藤俊雄 and Sonoda Kōyū, eds., *Saichō: Kenkairon, Sange*

gakushōshiki, tagōhen 最澄—顕戒論、山家学生式、他五篇, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, pp. 439-514.

Stevenson, Daniel B. (1987), *The T'ien-t'ai Four Forms of Samadhi and Late North-South Dynasties, Sui, and Early T'ang Buddhist Devotionalism*, Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.

-------- (1986), "The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism", in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, pp. 45-98.

Stevenson, Daniel and Kanno Hiroshi 菅野 博史 (2006), *The Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra's Course of Ease and Bliss: an annotated translation and study of Nanyue Huisi's (515-577) Fahua jing anlexing yi*, Tokyo : International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2006.

Stone, Jacqueline I. (2009), "Realizing This World as the Buddhaland", in *Readings of the Lotus Sūtra*, eds., Stephen F. Teiser and Jacqueline I. Stone. New York; Chichester : Columbia University Press, pp. 209-236

Strong, John S. (2004), *Relics of the Buddha*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sueki, Fumihiko 末木文美士 (1997), "Nara jidai no zen" 奈良時代の禅, in Sueki Fumihiko, ed., *Zen to shisō* 禅と思想, Tokyo: Perikansha, pp. 77-108.

Suzuki Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄 (1985), *Tō godai no zenshū* 唐五代の禅宗, Tokyo: Daito shuppansha.

Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集, vol. 3,Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1999-2003.

------- (1973), *The Laṅkavatāra Sūtra: A Mahayana Text* (translated for the first time from the original Sanskrit), London : Routledge & K. Paul.

------- (1953), 'Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih', in *Philosophy East and West* 3.1, pp. 25-46.

Taira Ryōshō 平了照 (1955), "Den Eshibon—*Ju bosatsukai bun*—ni tsuite 伝慧思本「受菩薩戒儀」について", in *Taishō daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 40 (1955), pp. 1-36.

Takakusu, Junjirō 高楠 順次郎 (1928-9), "Le voyage de Kanshin", in *Bulletin d'Ecole Francaise de l'Extr'me Orient* XXVIII (1928) pp.1-42 (Introduction), pp.442-472 (Translation I); BEFEO XXIX (1929) pp.48-62 (Translation II).

Takemura Noriyuki 竹村則行 (2003), "Shinragi Sai Chien to ban Tō Ko Yun no kōyū nitsuite" 新羅・崔致遠と晩唐・顧雲の交遊について (On the Friendship between Ch'oe Ch'iwŏn of Silla and Gu Yun of the Late Tang period), *Studies in literature* (*Bungaku kenkyū* 文學研究) 100, Departmental Bulletin Paper, Faculty of Humanities, Kyushu University, pp. 27-50.

Tamura Enchō 田村円澄 (1972), "Bukkyō no denrai" 仏教の傳来(The Introduction of Buddhism), in Nakamura Hajime, Kasahara Kazuo and Kanaoka Shōyū, eds., *Ajia Bukkyōshi: Nihon-hen 1, Asuka Nara Bukkyō* アジア仏教史・日本編 1, 仏教史飛鳥奈良仏教 (History of Buddhism in Asia: Japan Part 1, Buddhism in the Asuka and Nara Periods), Tokyo: Kōsei, pp. 53-86.

------ (1963), "Kimmei jūsan-nen Bukkyō toraisetsu to mappō shisō" 钦明十三年仏教渡来说と末法思想 (The Theory that Buddhism was Transmitted to Japan in the Thirteenth Year of Kimmei and Mappō Thought), in Tamura Enchō, *Nihon Reikishi* 日本歴史(Japanese History) no. 178, pp. 2-8.

------ (1959), "Mappō shisō no keisei" 末法思想の形成 (The Formation of Mappō Thought), in Tamura Enchō, *Nihon Bukkyō shisōshi kinkyū* 日本仏教思想史研究(Studies in the History of Japanese Buddhist Thought), Kyoto: Heirakuji, pp. 277-308.

Tan, Zhihui (2002), *Daoxuan's Vision of Jetavana: Imagining a Utopian Monastery in Early Tang*, PhD diss., the Univ. of Arizona, 2002.

Tanaka, Ryōshō 田中良昭 (1965), "*Nan-t'ien-chu-kuo P'u-ti-ta-mo-ch'am-shih Kuan-men* and *Hsiu-hsing-tsui-shang-ta-ch'eng-fa* (pseud): Some Relations among Zen, Pure Land, and Esoteric found in S. 6958 of T'un-huang MSS." 南天竺国菩提達摩禅師観門」「修行最上大乗法」(擬)¯敦煌出土スタイン本 6958 号にみる禅· 浄· 密の交渉, in *Journal of The Faculty of Buddhism (Komazawa Univ.)* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要 23, pp. 126-142.

---- (1983), *Tonkō Zenshū bunken no kenkyū* 敦煌禅宗文献の研究, Tōkyō : Daitō Shuppansha, 1983.

Thurman, Robert (1978), "Buddhist Hermeneutics", in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 46.1 (March 1978), pp. 28-34.

Tonami Mamoru 礪波護 (1982), "Tō chūki no Bukkyō to kokka" 唐中期の佛教と国家, in *Chūgoku chūsei no shūkyō to bunka* 中國中世の宗教と文化, ed., Fukunaga Mitsuji 福永光司, Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo, 1982, pp. 589-651.

Tsuchihashi Shuko 土橋秀高 (1960), "Tonkōbon jubosatsukaigi kō" 敦煌本受菩薩戒儀考, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 15 (1960), 8-1, pp. 33-42.

Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉 (1963), *Tsuda Sōkichi zenshū* 津田左右吉全集 (Complete Works of Tsuda Sōkichi), v. 2, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten

Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 (1929), “Shōtoku taishi Eshi zenshi goshin setsu ni kansuru gi” 聖徳太子慧思禅師後身説に関する疑, in *Reikishi Chiri* 日本歴史 53.1, pp. 1-13, reprinted in Tsuji Zennosuke (1931), *Nihon Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* (zokuhen) 日本仏教史の研究　続編, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Wagner, Robin Beth (1995), *Buddhism, Biography and Power: A Study of Daoxuan's Continued Lives of Eminent Monks,* Ph. D.Thesis, Harvard University, 1995.

Wang, Bangwei 王邦惟 (1997), “The Indian Origin of the Chinese Buddhist Chan School’s Patriarch Tradition,” in *Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thích Huyền-Vi,* à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire, dirigé par Bhikkhu Tampalawela Dhammaratana Chikkhu Pāsādika, Éditions You-Feng, Libraire Éditeur, Paris, pp. 260-270.

Wang, Yung 王勇(1994), *Shōtoku Taishi jikū chōetsu: rekishi o ugokashita Eshi kōshin setsu* 聖徳太子時空超越 : 歴史を動かした慧思後身説, Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten.

Watson, Burton (1997), *The Vimalakirti Sutra*, translated by Burton Watson from the Chinese version by Kumarajiva, New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Weinstein, Stanley (1989), “The Schools of Chinese Buddhism”, in Joseph M. Kitagawa, ed., *Buddhism and Asian History,* New York: Macmillan; London: Collier Macmillan, pp. 257-267.

------ (1987), *Buddhism under the T'ang*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Welter, Albert (2006), *Monks, rulers, and literati: the political ascendancy of Chan Buddhism*, Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Williams, Paul (1989), *Mahāyāna Buddhism: the Doctrinal Foundations*, London: Routledge.

Woo Kang (1938), *Histoire de la Bibliographie Chinoise*, Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.

Yamabe, Nobuyoshi (2005), “Visionary Repetance and Visionary Ordination in the *Brahma Net Sūtra*”, in *Going Forth*, William Bodiford, ed., pp. 17-39.

Yamauchi, Shunyū 山内舜雄 (1986), *Zen to Tendai shikan—“Zazen gi” to “Tendai shōshikan” to no hikaku kenkyū* 禅と天台止観-- 坐禅儀と『天台小止観』との比較研究. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.

Yampolsky, Philip B. (1967), *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch: the Text of the Tun-huang Manuscript, translated, with notes,* New York, Columbia University Press.

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 (2001), "Passion for Zen: Two Talks at the San Francisco Zen Center", translated and introduced by Urs App, in *The Eastern Buddhist* XXXIII, 2 (2001), pp. 62- 96.

--------- (1985), "Goroku no rekishi: Zen bunken no seiritsushiteki kenkyū" 語録の歴史: 禅文献 の成立史的研究, in *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方学報 57, pp. 211-663, (reprint as *Zen bunken no kenkyū* 禅文献の研究, *Yanagida Seizan zenshū* vol. 2.)

---------- (1983a), "The Li-Dai Fa-Pao Chi and the Ch'an Doctrine of Sudden Awakening", trans. by Carl W. Bielefeldt, in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, California: Asian Humanities Press, pp. 13-50.

---------- (1983b), "The 'Recorded Sayings' Texts of the Chinese Ch'an School", trans. by John R. McRae, in *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, Calif.: Asian Humanities Press, pp. 185-205.

-------- (1980-4) *Sodōshū Sakuin* 祖堂集索引, Kyōto : Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo, 1980-1984.

---------- (1969), *Zen no goroku* 禅の語録　vol. 8, Tokyo: Tsukuma shobō.

-------- (1967), *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禅宗史書の研究， *Yanagida Seizan shū* 柳田聖山集 vol. 6, Kyoto: Hōzōkan **法藏館**; reprint 2000.

Yi, Usŏng 李佑成 (1995), collator and trans., *Silla Sasan pimyŏng* 新羅四山碑銘, Asea munhwasa: Seoul,